4

The Two Views of Episcopacy:

Old and New.

THE

TWO VIEWS OF EPISCOPACY:

OLD AND NEW.

PHILADELPHIA:
STAVELY & McCALLA, 12 PEAR STREET.
[ORDERS SUPPLIED AT TWO DOLLARS PER DOZEN AND MAILED AT THAT PRICE POSTAGE PAID.]
1854.

PREFACE.

THE main points in the following pamphlet appeared in an Editorial article in the Episcopal Recorder of June 17th. Since then, the calls which have been made on the one side for the authority on which a portion of the statements it contains rests, and on the other, for an independent and increased circulation, have led to its expansion and issue in its present shape.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from
This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

https://archive.org/details/twoviewsofepisco00unse

THE TWO VIEWS OF EPISCOPACY,

OLD AND NEW.

The present lull of party feeling affords a peculiarly fit opportunity for the examination of those points in our theological system, which have been heretofore the chief subject of partizan contention. For the first time for many years—certainly, for the first time during the active life of most of those taking a practical interest in our communion,—have the waters sufficiently subsided to enable the foundations on which the ecclesiastical edifice rests to be re-examined with comparative dispassionateness.

We can now go back with some ease, and with a much diminished chance of difference as to facts, to the ground-work of our immediate communion. Manuscripts long since laid by—controversial tracts submerged by the flood of intermediate controversies, —rise to form the material for investigation. And if we will only consent to yield to our church standards at least that loyalty which we yield to mere human associations, questions long litigated may be solved with comparative ease. Let it be remembered that it is the PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THESE UNITED STATES, to which we have united ourselves, and that it is by the sense of the PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THESE UNITED STATES that we are to be governed. The bed is not so long or so wide but that we can stretch ourselves therein, and as we do so compass its entire extent. And the task is one which it is well for us to seize a fit opportunity to undertake. For, indeed, the standards of our communion, independently of the impress they received from the confessors both of the primitive church and of the reformation, have been adapted to our ecclesiastial condition by men of great piety, of much practical wisdom, and of true fidelity to the Christian cause. For years before our independent organization, as well as for years afterwards, their attention had been given to the question of Church policy, and when they came to construct a system, they were able not only to employ for the purpose these eminent qualifications, but to assume a position

which we cannot now hope to reach, either as to official responsibility, or as to openness of survey. It cannot be out of place, therefore, to take the present period for comparing the views now entertained on the main features of church government, with those which were operative in putting our ecclesiastical system in independent action. It is to this object that the following pages are devoted.

In one respect the task is comparatively easy. The present development of our ecclesiastical theory may be taken in a succinct shape from a catechism lately published by the "General Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Union and Church Book Society," on "the Christian Ministry."*

The Society from which the tract springs numbers all our Bishops among its Vice Presidents, and although some—perhaps a decided majority—take no part in the preparation or revision of its publications, yet there are several entitled to all official and personal respect, whose interest in it is active and influential. Independently of the high intelligence and the personal respectability of the gentlemen engaged in the general management of the Society, we have the advantage of a committee consisting of some of the most estimable clergymen of our church, several of whom no one can charge with extreme views. Almost simultaneously with the appearance of the tract itself, there emanated from the last mentioned committee a circular addressed to each parish minister of the Church, in which, in terms of much moderation, they invoke a general support for their publications, on the ground that those publications will contain such matter only as the common opinion of the church will sustain. It was in October, 1853, according to their circular, that the committee went into office, and as the tract in question bears the impress of 1854, and has only recently been received, it must be supposed in some sense to be recognized and ratified by them. Prepared before their term of office it probably was, but its emission *during* their term, gives it the benefit of their *imprimatur*. It has never been retracted by them. They have never even given it a qualified disavowal. We are able, therefore, with safety to take it as one of the bearings by which our ecclesiactical cause is to be reckoned,

*The Catechist's Manual; *or a Systematic course of instruction for children, in the doctrine, discipline, order and Worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church, with notes and illustrations for the use of catechists; by Rev. William Staunton, M. A., author of "Church Dictionary," etc. New York: Gen. Prot. Epis. S. S. Union and Church Book Society.* 1854. *Series VI. The Christian Ministry.*

and this without the risk of being told that in so doing, we have suffered ourselves to be imposed upon by false landmarks put up by either the designing or the irresponsible. For so far from this being the case, the standard of observation is erected before our very eyes, and, engaged in the work of planting it we see men whom we must all reckon as marked in every sense by a true sense of honor, by a just regard to truth, and by what in ecclesiastical matters may be denominated a qualified degree of moderation. It is therefore with perfect safety that we accept the principles they propound to us, as those of at least a respectable body of clergymen, selected without reference to old party lines. It is very well that it is so, for this very fact gives dignity and dispassionateness to a discussion of their opinions. And what is at least equally important, it enables those opinions to be controverted, if wrong, without the suspicion of party motive; and it will make the consideration of their correctness, on the part of both critic and reader, a matter of individual conscientiousness and not of partizan opinion.

The propositions bearing on the present enquiry which are set out in the catechism so issued, may be classified as follows, copious extracts being given with each, to show the correctness of the deduction:

I. Episcopal succession is necessary to salvation.

Q. Then had the first Apostles power to make *other* Apostles? (Note 20.)

A. Yes; and it was the same as if *Christ* had made them.

Q. How so?

A. Because they acted *for* Christ, and could give to *others* the same authority which Christ had given to *them.*

Q. And if so, were the Bishops they made as much the Ministers of Christ as the Apostles themselves?

A. Yes.

Q. Could those Bishops also make or appoint others to come after them?

A. Yes; for all Bishops have the power to make or ordain other Bishops.

Q. If this had not been so, what would have happened?

A. There would have been no more Apostles or Bishops, after the first ones had died.

Q. And what then?

A. There would have been no Ministers in the Church, and none to govern it, or preach the Gospel, or give the Holy Sacraments.

Q. And would not the Church soon have come to an end?

A. Yes, because none could be baptized; and so, when the first Christians were dead, there would be none to come after them.

Q. But was this what our Saviour intended?

A. No, for His Church was to last till the end of the world.

Q. Then, does it not follow that there were to be Ministers also till the end of the world?

A. *Yes, or else there could be no Church.*

II. EPISCOPAL SUCCESSION IS SUFFICIENT FOR SALVATION.

Q. Why do not all who call themselves Christians belong to this Church?

A. Because they, or their forefathers, have been led to separate themselves from it.

Q. Has this occasioned much evil?

A. Yes, it has produced strife, envy, and divisions, and the loss of charity.

Q. And what else?

A. It has separated thousands of people from the care of Christ's own ministers.

Q. Can this be pleasing to God?

A. No; for He would have all Christians gathered into one fold.

Q. And is it not easy to *find* this fold?

A. Yes, for it is the Church which has existed all along since the days of the Apostles.

Q. For what then should we often pray?

A. That God would take away all strife, hatred, and divisions, and bring back those who have gone astray from His Church.

Q. *Would that be a most happy thing?*

A. *Yes, for then the Church would joyfully serve our Lord in all godly quietness,—and after walking in the ways of truth and peace, we should at last be numbered with the saints in glory everlasting.*

III. ASSURANCE OF SALVATION DEPENDS UPON "FINDING OUT" THAT THE LINE IS TRUE.

Q. Suppose some man now-a-days should say he was a Bishop how would we know whether he really were one or not?

A. *By finding out whether he had been consecrated or made such by those who were Bishops before him.*

Q. And what else?

A. *By learning that those Bishops also had been consecrated by those before them; and so on till we trace their line back to the beginning.*

IV. NON-EPISCOPAL CLERGYMEN ARE NOT ONLY NOT "MINISTERS," BUT NOT EVEN "LAYMEN;" ARE INVOLVED IN THE GUILT OF CORAH, DATHAN AND ABIRAM; AND ARE "THIEVES AND ROBBERS."

Q. But does the Church reject those who have not been ordained by Bishops?

A. Yes; she never receives them as lawful Ministers of Christ.

Q. Are they ever allowed to officiate in the Church?

A. No, until they confess the true faith, and are ordained by a Bishop.

Q. But, does the Church, then, reject many who call themselves Ministers?

A. Yes, all the Ministers of such sects or denominations as have not true Bishops.

Q. How is this?

A. Because without Bishops, they have not the power to ordain ministers of Christ.

Q. If a man is able to preach well, or pray well, does that make him a lawful Minister? (Note 26.)

A. No; for this might be done by many pious men among the people.

Q. And how would it be, if such person were also very learned and eloquent?

A. That would not give him any right to act as a Minister.

Q. Suppose he were also elected or chosen by the people,—what would he be then? (Note 27.)

A. Only a layman, the same as before. (Note 28.)

Q. Why so?

A. Because he has received no authority from *God*, to Minister in His Church.

24. "In the Old Testament we read of the awful punishment of Corah, Dathan, and Abiram, for usurping the priests' office; and king Uzziah was smitten with leprosy for daring to imitate their example. Those who undertook the prophetical office without divine mission, were most severely rebuked. In the New Testament we observe the same principle of the necessity; a commission from God to minister in sacred things."—*Palmer on the Church*, i. p. 164.

26. "The notion that men may undertake to be ministers of God, without being *authorized* by God, carries its own refutation along with it, at the very first view. Were all men entitled to assume this office at pleasure the Apostle would have asked in vain, 'Are all apostles, are all prophets, are *all teachers?*' (1 Cor. xii. 29.) He could not have added: 'God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all the Churches of the Saints' (1 Cor. xiv. 33): for if all men were entitled, on their own opinion of their fitness to assume the office of the ministry, there could be nothing but endless confusion and disorder. The Scriptures, however, leave no doubt on the matter; such intruders are characterized, by our Lord as men 'that came in their own name'. (John v. 43.) He declares that they are 'thieves and robbers.'"—*Palmer on the Church*, i. p. 166.

28. The word "layman" is here used in its popular or general sense. Strictly speaking, no one is a layman unless he is a member of the one Holy Catholic Church.

V. THESE PROPOSITIONS ARE HELD BY OUR CHURCH WITHOUT ANY DOUBT.

Q. Would the Church teach and act thus, if there were any doubt on the matter?

A. No; for if Ministers might be lawfully made some other way, it would be wrong in us to reject them.

To what extent these positions conflict with our own standards and doctrines as set forth and taught by the framers of our present ecclesiastical policy, will be seen by an examination of the following points, each of which will be sustained by proof which we conceive will admit of no dispute.

I. The *invisible* Church consists of those who are in a state of covenant salvation, without regard to ecclesiastical position.

II. Of the *visible* Church all unapostatized baptized persons (whether the sacrament be Episcopally performed or not), are members.

III. Non-Episcopal communions are recognized by both our standards and our usages as *Churches.*

1. *The invisible Church consists of those who are in a state of covenant salvation, without regard to ecclesiastical position.*

This will scarcely be doubted, so far as the last clause is concerned, by any one familiar with our standards, though with regard to the first clause, much latitude of expression exists. In the collect for the fifth Sunday after Epiphany, the invisible church or "Household of our Lord" is defined to comprise those "who lean only upon the hope of His heavenly grace." In still briefer terms it is declared by Bishop Tomline—an authority above all suspicion of Low-Churchmanship—to consist of "those persons who have truly believed and obeyed the gospel." And our own Prayer-book, in giving its answer to the enquiry "who are these in bright array," has selected a definition by James Montgomery, a dissenting Minister, which gives substantially the same reply, though with an exquisite delicacy of diction, which makes it well worthy of its theme and its place. That such is the true character of the invisible Church, as defined by Scripture, has been recently shown by an eminent divine of our own Church, with a fidelity which scarcely admits of impeachment. (See Appendix A.)

2. *Of the* visible *Church all unapostatized baptized persons (whether the sacrament be Episcopally performed or not), are members.*

"So complete is this body," says Bishop H. U. Onderdonk, in speaking of the visible Church (1 Sermons and charges, 234), "as enjoined by its head, that admission into any part of it, is admission to the whole dominion everywhere: the citizenship in the visible Church, once attained, is full and universal, needing no repetition when we remove from one branch to another. Hence baptism, by which we attain this citizenship, is once, and once only performed."

The catechism is conclusive on this point, in declaring the baptized child to be a "member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven;" and the baptismal service is equally explicit in announcing him to be "received into the congregation of Christ's flock."

Nor is it necessary that baptism to have this effect should be administered by a minister Episcopally ordained. Bishop Brownell's statement of the view of our own Church in this respect will surely not be questioned when it is recollected that it was concurred in by both Bishop White and Bishop Hobart.

"Bishop White in his Memoir of the Church, deprecates what he considers to be an increasing tendency in some of the clergy, to administer

Episcopal Baptism to such as desire it, in alleged doubts of the validity of former baptism. This he thinks to be contrary to the rubrics, and demonstrated so by many judicious divines of the Church of England. The question of the validity of baptism by persons not episcopally ordained, was first started in England in the latter part of the reign of Queen Ann, and was connected with political manœuvres in favor of the Pretender. It was then customary to stigmatize the Hanoverian Family as unbaptized Lutherans. Archdeacon Sharp refers to this question in one of his charges. "In that year" (1712), says he, "the dispute about the invalidity of lay baptism running pretty high, the two Archbishops, with all the Bishops of their provinces that were in town, came unanimously to this resolution, that lay baptism should be discouraged as much as possible; but, if the essentials had been preserved in a baptism by a lay hand, it was not to be repeated. But then, when it was proposed that a declaration of their sentiments to this purpose should be published, in order to silence or determine the debates on this question, it was resolved, upon mature deliberation, to leave the question as much undecided by any public declaration, as it was left in the public offices and canons of the Church, for the better security of discipline, and to prevent any advantages that might be taken by dissenters, or seem to be given them, in favor of their baptisms: though they do not properly come within the questions of lay baptisms in cases of extremity." This question was again considerably agitated in England a few years ago, on the occasion of a Clergyman's refusing to bury a child who had been baptized by a dissenting minister. An action was brought by the parent, and was decided against the minister, by Sir John Nicholls, upon reasons grounded altogether on the Rubrics of the Church. Upon these facts, Bishop White gives it as his opinion that "the Rubrics of the Church of England, are in perfect accordance with the sense of Scripture." *Bishop Brownell's Common Prayer Book, page* 403, *and see to the same effect Bishop White's Memoirs, page* 369.

As will be seen hereafter these views were maintained by Bishop White to his last days, it having been one of his last offices to vindicate them in a manuscript letter now for the first time printed.—(See appendix B.)

It will be seen, therefore, that so far from its being true, as stated in the catechism before us, that "none could (can) be baptized" by non-Episcopalians, and that where there is a failure of Episcopal baptism there are no Christians,—so far from this being the case, persons baptized by non-Episcopalians are not only "Christians" but as much members of the visible Church as we are ourselves.

III. *Non-Episcopal communions are recognized by both our standards and our usage as churches.*

1. *Preface to Prayer Book.*

To the Preface to the Prayer Book we may naturally look for a statement of the views entertained both by ourselves and of our Mother Church as to our relative positions. The revolution was then safely over. The various religious societies, like husband-

men after a long winter, were surveying their respective fields, and making arrangements for the long delayed harvest. Into their council steps our own communion, leaning on the arm of the church from whom her orders were derived. It is obvious that she had one of two courses open. She might have said "Ho! all ye sects keep back for THE CHURCH. You are all in a state of schism; your members are outside of the visible church; if you wish safety come to me." Or she might have said "I am happy, fellow churches, to salute in you a family of sisters who though not so fortunate as myself as to the quality of organization are yet equally legitimate. And I shall take the first opportunity of recognizing you by your proper title as vested with the same organic powers as myself, for in no better way can I attest your validity." If such were the views of our church,—and that they were will be shown under another head,—what better way of expressing them could she have found than that she actually adopted in the preface to the Prayer Book. As if to attest her consciousness not only of the existence but of the independent capacity of the American Non-Episcopal Churches she declares that by the establishment of independence "the different religious denominations of Christians in these States were left at full and equal liberty to model and organize *their respective churches*, and forms of worship and discipline, in such manner as they might judge most convenient for their future prosperity; consistently with the constitution and laws of their country." We have here two positive statements, (1) that the "denominations" or "sects" are churches as well as ourselves; and (2) that they have the power of independent government. And we did this under very solemn circumstances, which give the declaration something of the force of a compact. It was at the moment when we presented to the English Episcopate our petition for an independent existence. As a basis for our application, we sent this very book, and with it two Bishops-elect (White and Provoost) who, as will be presently seen, maintained in like manner the validity of our non-Episcopal American Churches; and so entirely did the introduction of this feature meet with the approval of the English Bishops that it was not until the Bishops-elect signed a certificate of their adhesion to the amended book, preface, ordinal and articles, that the former consented to consecrate. And now after having obtained consecration on this basis,—after having entered into the council of Protestant churches as an equal, and been introduced to them as such,—a departure so momentous as that which the "General Sunday School Union" takes cannot be regarded without grave anxiety.

(2) *Collects.*

The collect for the fifth Sunday after the Epiphany, as has been just seen, defines the "church and household" of our Lord as "they who do lean *only* upon the hope of Thy (His) heavenly grace." It is clear therefore that those who lean on anything else than our Lord's grace (e. g. an external ministry) are excluded from this category. It will be seen therefore that the *invisible* church, to which this collect refers, is not only declared to be composed of those who rely on our Saviour's grace, *but of those alone.* The definition of the *visible* church is not less emphatic. In every case where it is referred to it is treated irrespective of denominational limits. Of this the collect for All Saints' Day and the prayer for all conditions of men are striking illustrations. In respect to the latter, says Bishop Brownell, "we pray not so much for the external prosperity of any portion of it, but for the *whole church:* the oriental, the Greek, the Latin, *the Reformed, with* every denomination of Christians."

(3) *Articles.*

The 19th Article, which is the governing one in this respect, says:

"The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to God's ordinance, in all that of necessity be requisite to the same."

Here we find one feature,—the preachings of the PURE WORD OF GOD,—which in the catechism before us, is entirely omitted; and we find a feature omitted,—an episcopal succession,—which in the catechism is made the distinguishing characteristic. We say nothing of the injurious effect upon a young mind of such a treatment of an acknowledged standard; nor is it necessary to remark that freedom of construction of municipal and domestic sanctions is sufficiently developed in these mature days to relieve the "General Sunday School Union" from the task of giving it an additional impulse by so dashing a specimen of criticism as the present. It is enough to observe that the practical effect of this violent wresting of the text is to produce precisely the result which the framers of the article did not intend, viz: to recognize the Romish communion as a pure church, and to *un*-church the churches of the Reformation.

And indeed if the framers of our articles had studied to construct formulas, in which the necessity of an episcopal succession was excluded, they could scarcely have adopted language more pertinent than they actually took. Nor are we allowed to remain in doubt on this point, for with scrupulous care they selected terms to which

a judicial as well as a practical construction had been already fixed. They sought out the Augsburg confession, the oldest and the best settled PROTESTANT formula then in existence, and adapted it as follows :

ENGLISH ARTICLES.	AUGSBURG CONFESSION.
The visible church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly administered according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.	Est autem Ecclesia congregatio Sanctorum, in qua Evangelium recte docetur, et recte administrantur sacramenta.
It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering in the congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent, to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by those who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard.	Docent quod nemo debeat in Ecclesia publice docere, aut Sacramenta administrare, nisi rite vocatur.

It will be seen that of the two formulas, ours is the most definite and precise in its limitation of the term "duly," for it superadds to the Augsburg symbol the words "in all things that are of necessity requisite to the same," making variation in all other matters consistent with church existence.

But as the Augsburg confession beyond all question recognized non-Episcopal communions as *churches*, *a fortiori* is this the case with our own article.

In what sense the 19th article has been construed by our standard authorities will be seén in the following passages :

"This expression seems to be used in contradistinction to the mystical or visible church of Christ. The mystical church consists of those persons who have truly believed and obeyed the Gospel, and who are conceived, although they have lived at different periods, to be united to one body, which is called mystical or invisible, not only because they are not now all upon earth; but because the qualities and properties, which give them a claim to be members of this blessed society were never the objects of sense, and could not be judged by men from merely external circumstances. The visible church in its most extensive sense may include all persons who are or have been, by outward professions, Christians, whether they have or have not believed all the doctrines, or obeyed all the precepts of the gospel. This may be called the visible

Catholic Church: and our Saviour himself alludes to the mixture of real and nominal Christians in his visible Church. Matt. xiii. 47—54. But in this Article the "visible church" is used in a more limited sense; and comprehends the Christians of only one country or city, or of one persuasion: thus it mentions the Church of Jerusalem, of Alexandria, of Antioch, and of Rome: and in like manner we often speak of the Church of England, of Holland, of Geneva, and of the Lutheran Church: and in all those different churches are parts of the visible Catholic Church. It is well known that the Church of Rome considers itself as the only Christian Church; but on the other hand we extend the name to any "congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same."—*Bishop Tomline, as incorporated by Bishop Brownell in his Commentary on the Prayer Book, page* 712.

Archbishop Bancroft, whose authority as a High Churchman has never been disputed, issued in 1607 an exposition of the articles, written by his chaplain, Mr. Rodgers, which he officially required all the parishes in his province to procure. In this he deduces from the article six propositions:

"I. None publicly may preach but such as thereunto are authorized. 2. They must not be silent who by office are bound to preach. 3. The sacrament may not be administered in the congregation but by a lawful minister. 4. There is a lawful ministry in the Church. 5. They are lawful ministers which be ordained by men lawfully appointed to the calling and sending forth of ministers. Before ministers are to be ordained, they are to be chosen and called."

And then, taking up the same line of argument that we have already glanced at, in connection with the Augsburg confession, he invokes as his authority the Foreign Reformed Churches, *as follows:*

On the first: "All this is acknowledged by the reformed Churches;" referring to the Helvetic, Bohemic, French, and other Confessions. On the second: "Hereunto bear witness all the Churches of God which be purged from superstition and errors;" referring to the same Confessions. On the third: "Hereunto do the Churches of God subscribe;" referring to the same confessions. On the fifth: "So testify with us the true Churches elsewhere in the world;" referring to the same Confessions. On the sixth: "And this do the Churches Protestant by their Confessions approve;" referring to the same Confessions.

It remains only to notice Bishop Burnet's exposition of this very point, whose treatise is officially recommended by our own House of Bishops to the study of theological students, and who in the very book so recommended thus speaks:

"If a company of Christians find the public worship where they live to be so defiled that they cannot with a good conscience join in it, and if they do not know of any place to which they can conveniently go where they may worship God purely and in a regular way,

if, I say, such a body, finding some that have been ordained, though to the lower functions, should submit itself entirely to their conduct, or finding none of those, should by a common consent desire some of their own number to minister to them in holy things, and should upon that beginning grow up to a regulated constitution, though we are very sure this is quite out of all rule, and could not be done without a very great sin, unless the necessity were great and apparent; yet if the necessity is real and not feigned, this is not condemned or annulled by the article; for when this grows to a constitution, and when it was begun by the consent of a Body, who are supposed to have an authority in such an extraordinary case, *whatever some hotter spirits have thought of this since that time, yet we are very sure, that not only those who penned the Articles, but the Body of this Church for above half an age after, did, notwithstanding those irregularities, acknowledge the Foreign Churches, so constituted, to be true Churches as to all the essentials of a Church, though they had been at first irregularly formed, and continued still to be in an imperfect state. And therefore the general words in which this part of the Article is framed, seem to have been designed on purpose not to exclude them.*" Burnett's *Exposition of the XXXIX Articles*, 5th ed. 1746.)

(4.) *Canons.*

One point, though not immediately connected with our own communion, may be noticed, under this head, as it strikes at the root of the question of Anglican construction. By the English 55th Canon of 1604, all the English clergy are required, in the bidding prayer before, or rather in the commencement of the sermon, to pray for "the Church of Scotland." It is an historical fact that the Church of Scotland, at the time this canon was passed, was Presbyterian, as it now is. "And, consequently,"—we quote from Mr. Good's excellent tract,—"the very men who are now protesting against the recognition of any ordinations as valid but Episcopal, and contending that it is the doctrine of our Church, that there is no such thing as a valid ministry but through an apostolically descended episcopate, are by canon bound solemnly to recognize in their prayers every Sunday the existence of a valid ministry without any such ordination. For a prayer for the Presbyterian 'Church of Scotland' clearly involves such a recognition."

(5.) *Ordinal.*

The preface to our ordination service, is as follows:

It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Which Offices were evermore had in such reverend Estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by Public Prayer, with Imposition of Hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful Authority. And therefore, to the intent that these Orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed in this Church (no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, in this

Church, or suffered to execute any of the said Functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had Episcopal Consecration or Ordination.)

And none shall be admitted a Deacon, Priest, or Bishop, except he be of the age which the Canon in that case provided may require.

The writer of the catechism before us, has contented himself with cutting from the context the passage in brackets, and serving it up as the entire view of "the church" from which the indispensable necessity of Episcopacy to the *existence* of a church is to be deduced.

Had he introduced the whole the following striking contrast would have been exhibited:

PRAYER BOOK.	TRACTARIAN CATECHISM.
Holy Scriptures and ancient authors prove that from the Apostles' times three orders existed.	Episcopacy is essential to Christianity.
therefore,	*therefore,*
In "*this*" Church no man shall be accounted a lawful Bishop, Priest or Deacon, without Episcopal consecration or ordination.	In "*the*" church no man shall be accounted a lawful Bishop, Priest or Deacon, without Episcopal consecration or ordination.

Let, in the first place, the circumstances be considered under which the limitation in question found its way into our ritual. It was not there at the reformation. It was not there even in the "high-flying" times of Laud. It was not part of the policy of the first, nor consistent with the principles of the second; for the *reformers* needed not to fence in the church from dissenting aggression at a time when there were no dissenters, and Laud would have rejected with scorn a law which by making Episcopacy a local and eclectic rule of government, to some extent negatives its necessity to the universal church. But at the time of the adoption of the uniformity act, and of this portion of the ordinal, which was a necessary sequence, the church of England required some such guard on her integrity. The "first duty of a government," says Guizot, "is self-preservation." Let it be remembered that when Charles II. was restored, a majority of the beneficed clergy were non-Episcopalian, and if they had been permitted to transfer themselves to the reëstablished church without some guarantee of allegiance, Episcopacy would have been exposed to the most protracted and perilous conflicts. It was necessary to require—"self-preservation" as well as sound doctrine exacted it—that none

should be permitted to hold office in this "Episcopal Church" who were not "Episcopalians," and who did not take their official title through an Episcopal order. The uniformity act—a measure of great practical wisdom, which it is important not to confound with the abuses which afterwards worked themselves into its administration, was the result of the necessity. Strictly analagous was the course adopted on the formation of our own federal constitution, and the interpretation which belongs to the one instrument belongs to the other. Not only must a foreigner, in order to become a citizen, take an oath of allegiance to our republican system, not only must he abjure all foreign potentates, but he must surrender any foreign title whatever. So it is with our church. She permits no divided allegiance. She admits no man to take part in her government who is the adherent of a foreign ecclesiastical policy. But by this she passes judgment on the validity of foreign orders, only to the extent in which our republican system passes judgment on the validity of foreign governments. And it is fortunate for the maintenance of her real integrity that the language she has used in this respect, is so identical with that of our civil sanction, as to prevent a different interpretation.

But against the interpretation of the New York catechism a familiar rule of criticism interposes itself, *Expressio unius est exclusio alterius.* The limitation of a law to a specific jurisdiction excludes its operation from all outside. Suppose for instance the Legislature of New York should pass a law to the effect that the cutting of timber in a particular county should be prohibited. The fact of the limitation to the county in question, would be an exclusion of its operation from the rest of the State. Or suppose a convention should pass a canon declaring that in "this" diocese no clergyman shall be considered as canonically resident who does not hold a parish. It certainly will not be pretended that all persons professing obedience to such a canon, must regard it as defining the ecclsiastical *status* of clergymen residing in other jurisdictions.

But apply the same species of interpretation to our own civil fundamental sanctions and see to what it leads.

BILL OF RIGHTS.	TRACTARIAN SYLLOGISM.
A republican government is most in accordance with natural and divine law.	Republicanism is essential to to the existence of any government.
therefore,	*therefore,*
No authority shall be recognized *in these United States,* which is not derived directly from the people.	No authority is to be recognized *any where,* that is not derived directly from the people.

Such a fillibustering method of construction as this has not been reached even by the wildest of our *political* propagandists. And yet our *ecclesiastical* propagandists, not only boldly proclaim it, but insist that our children should be taught to say that "the" church holds it without any "doubt." But this is not all. The adoption of this interpretation leads to absurdities still wilder. The ordinal, it is proclaimed, announces principles binding on the whole visible Church. If so, it is binding in one clause as much as in another, for the enacting sanction in each is the same. We are therefore in the ridiculous position of asserting that no ordination is valid which is not conducted precisely in the shape as to postures, formulas, and language which our ordinal prescribes. And if the construction is worth anything it goes so far as to require that no person, no matter in what communion, shall be "accounted" a clergyman who was not of our own canonical age, which would break in a dozen places the chain of our Episcopal succession. Fortunately, however, we are able to extricate ourselves from these predicaments, if we had no other means, by the well known principles that a law which is in its provisions manifestly sectional can only be treated as binding in the jurisdiction to which it is applied.

The soundness of the construction here assumed, is established by authority the purity of which is unassailable.

When Archbishop Leighton was consecrated Bishop in 1661, he was required to submit to be first ordained Deacon and Priest, on the ground partly of the Act of Uniformity, and partly that, though it might be reasonable to allow Presbyterian Orders under some circumstances, yet that this had been received from those who were in a state of schism, and had without reason revolted from their bishops. Leighton's view on the subject is thus stated by Bishop Burnet:—"Leighton did not stand much upon it. He *did not think Orders given without bishops were null and void.* He thought the forms of government were not settled by such positive laws as were unalterable; but only by Apostolic practices, which, as he thought, authorized Episcopacy as the best form. Yet he did not think it necessary to the being of a Church. *But he thought that every Church might make such rules of Ordination as they pleased, and that they might reordain all that came to them from any other Church; and that the reordaining a priest ordained in another Church imported no more but that they received him into Orders according to their rules, and did not infer the annulling the Orders he had formerly received.*" (*Hist. of his Own Times*, vol. i. p. 140.)

And still more to the point is the commentary of Bingham:

Nor do I see what can be urged farther in this case, unless it be the business of reordination, which some reckon so great a charge against the Act of Uniformity; because it obliges every beneficiary to receive Episcopal ordination, according to the form and rites of the Church of England. *But what harm there is in this, I confess I never could see;* and I am sure there is nothing in it contrary to the principles or practices of Geneva, nor perhaps of the whole French Church. For at Geneva it is their common practice whenever they remove a minister from one Church to another, to give him a new and solemn ordination by imposition of hands and prayer.....Now, if it be lawful, by the rules of the Church of Geneva, for a minister to receive a new solemn ordination, when he is translated from one Church to another; why cannot men in England consent to receive a new ordination, when the law requires it, in order to settle themselves regularly in any Church? especially when *it is for the sake of peace and union*, and take off all manner of *doubtfulness and scruples* from the people. *I dispute not now, whether their former ordinations were valid* (this question, we see, he does not consider to affect the point to be determined, namely, whether they could properly submit to reordination); it is certain, they are not more valid than those of Geneva; nor can they themselves think them more valid than the ministers of Geneva think theirs; wherefore if it be lawful at Geneva for a minister to receive a new ordination, because the laws require it, I do not see what can make it unlawful in England to submit to the same thing, in compliance with the law, when men have no other regular way to settle themselves in any cure; *let their opinion of their former ordination be what it will*, WHICH COMES NOT INTO THE PRESENT DISPUTE. For even supposing *their former ordination* (*i. e.* the Presbyterian *in this country*) *to be valid, I show they may submit to a new ordination without sin;* and if the will be peaceable, they *ought to do it*, after the example of Geneva, rather than set up separate meetings, and preach against the will of their superiors, to the disturbance of the peace of the Church." (*Bingham's Works*, vol. ix. ed. 1845, pp. 206,. 297.)

To the same effect is the elaborate argument of Bishop White, in a pamphlet hereafter fully cited.

(6.) *Authorities sanctioned by House of Bishops.*

In 1804, as is well known, our House of Bishops, in obedience to a resolution of the General Convention, "established,"—we quote from the text—"a course of theological studies." The writers to whom they refer it is out of the limits of the present design to examine seriatim. It is enough to call attention to the three principal authorities whom they advance in connection with these very topics. These are,—

1. *Mr. Hooker's ecclesiastical polity.*

"Now, whereas hereupon (he observes) some do infer that no ordination can stand, but only such as is made by bishops which have had their ordination likewise by other Bishops before them, till we come to the very Apostles of Christ themselves; in which respect *it was demanded of*

Beza at Poissie, "By what authority he could administer the holy sacraments, &c." (Our readers will observe *the instance cited*, the very case now in question between the Archbishop and his assailants.) . . . . To this we answer, *that there may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason* to ALLOW ORDINATION MADE WITHOUT A BISHOP. The whole Church visible being the true original subject of all power, it hath not ordinarily allowed any other than Bishops alone to ordain; howbeit, as the ordinary course is ordinarily in all things to be observed, so it may be, in some cases, not unnecessary that we decline from the ordinary ways. Men may be extraordinarily, yet allowably, two ways *admitted unto spiritual functions in the Church.* One is, when God Himself doth of Himself raise up any . . . . Another. . . . when the exigence of necessity doth constrain to leave the usual ways of the Church, which otherwise we would willingly keep." (*Eccl. Pol.* viii. 14. See also iii. 11.)

Here *Beza's* orders are directly recognized as valid. And yet the Dutch Reformed communion in this country, to say nothing of those cognate bodies with which its ordination has mingled, takes its succession from the exact line of Beza. If, then, Beza's ordination was valid in Holland, it did not lose its efficacy when transplanted in 1640 to this country, unless it faded away on approaching the Romish episcopate of Quebec. This, however—arguing on the milder Anglo-Catholic view—it is clear it did not do, as it was recognized as an independent luminary at the period when in Europe it was revolving in immediate proximity to the central orb of the Pope himself. It is plain, therefore, that the Dutch Reformed Church had a valid ministry in this country upon Hooker's principles until the arrival of the first Reformed Episcopate. As will be in a moment seen this Episcopate was that of the ancient Church of Moravia, which certainly was not *un*churched by approaching the Dutch establishment. But the Moravians at once recognized the Dutch; and if they had the power of ratification, as Anglo-Catholic authority teaches they had, exercised it in the most emphatic manner by intercommunion. Supposing, however, that the Anglican Episcopacy was the one whose approach unchurched such imperfect organizations as were churches only when *necessarily* debarred from Episcopal ordination, how does the matter then stand? Simply thus,—that the *Anglican* Church having recognized the *Moravian* Church in this country as possessed of a valid ministry,—with of course, on Anglo-Catholic reasoning, "the power to bind,"—the first is estopped by the second's prior ratification. Such, treating it technically, and on Anglo-Catholic principles, has been the method by which the Dutch communion preserves its place in that orrery which recent ingenuity has constructed for the elucidation of the modern "Church" system. If the logical process is attenuated and refined,

let it be recollected that it is not out of place if it demonstrates the unreal character of the paper fabric of which it treats.

In another passage Hooker places the claims of Episcopacy on that same "low" view as to custom making succession, which Bishop White so much delighted to announce:

"'*Let them* [i. e. *bishops*] *continually bear in mind, that it is rather the force of custom, whereby the Church, having so long found it good to continue under the regiment of her virtuous bishops, doth still uphold, maintain, and honor them in that respect, than that any such true and heavenly law can be showed by the evidence whereof it may of a truth appear, that the Lord himself hath appointed presbyters forever to be under the regiment of bishops,*' adding, that '*their authority*' is '*a sword which the Church hath power to take from them.*' (*Ib.* vii. 5. See also i. 14, and iii. 10.)"

2. *Archbishop Potter on Church government.*

It is enough to say that if this eminent prelate's facts, and the theory of the New York Society are put together, our communion will be placed in a state of ecclesiastical depression, for which, according to the New York nomenclature the term "sect" —be the irreverence not ours,—will be too honorable. For Archbishop Potter, in 1737,—long enough before our own Episcopal occupancy,—addressed a formal letter to the Moravian Episcopate, congratulating them on their undoubted succession and primitive doctrine; and, if this was not enough, aided them in "establishing" themselves by act of parliament in this country as an undoubted Apostolic Church. And both Bishop White and Bishop Seabury, as will be in a moment seen, recognized them as having a valid Episcopate in this country prior to ourselves.

3. *Bishop Burnet on the Articles, &c.*

Bishop Burnet has been cited under another head, and it will not be disputed that *he*, at least, held the principle that episcopacy, though sanctioned by apostolic usage, and necessary to the proper development of a church, was not essential to its existence.

4. *Bishop Pearson on the Creed.*

However high may be the estimate which this very authoritative writer places on the ministry as a *positive* institution, his views as to its *relative* necessity,—the only point before us,—are embodied in the following paragraph in a way which shows that in no point he differs from the weight of Church authority:

"This promise giveth not only an assurance of the continuance of the Church, but also the cause of that continuance, which is the presence of Christ. Where two or three are met together in the name of Christ, there he is in the midst of them (Matt. xviii. 20); and thereby become a church; for they are as a builded house, and the son within the house; wherefore, seeing that Christ doth promise his presence unto the Church,

even unto the end of the world, he doth thereby assure us of the existence of the Church, until that time of which his presence is the cause. Indeed, this is the City of the Lord of Hosts, the City of Our God. God will establish it forever, (Ps. xlviii. 8,) as the great prophet of our church hath said." Pearson on the Creed, Article IX, (p. 512 Appleton's edition.)

(7.) *Consent of the framers of our American Church policy.*

The history of Episcopacy in this country is marked by a very striking fact, which the managers of the New York Society could not have but overlooked when they put it in the mouths of even the young of our communion, to say that there can be but one Bishop in a diocese (p. 13), and that consequently all subsequent ministers are schismatic. It is a matter of history,—overlooked now, but no less true,—that the Moravian succession was established in this country as early as 1749,—that by it an Episcopate, acknowledged to be valid by our mother Church in the most solemn manner, was planted on our shores,—and that it entered quietly on the then unoccupied ground, in which it has ever since exercised Episcopal jurisdiction. For the truth of these positions it is only necessary to refer to the following unquestionable authorities:

Archbishop Secker, whose means of information, and whose devotion to the interests of the Anglican communion in this country, are both indisputable, in a letter to "the Right Honorable Horatio Walpole," written in 1751, but not published until after his death, when in accordance to his directions, it was given to the world with other of his works, makes the following statement:

"It ought to be considered further that an act of the last session of Parliament (1749) which passed without any opposition from anybody, hath expressly established Moravian Bishops in America, who have much higher and stricter notions of church government and discipline than we have. If for want of these (Anglican Bishops, for which the object of the letter was to petition) the Moravian Bishops should ordain such ministers for our people as they thought proper, or should they, by administering confirmation, or by the reverence for their episcopal character, be continually gaining converts from us, it would be a very undesirable thing on many accounts, particularly on this, that most of them refuse taking oaths and bearing arms."—6 *Secker's Works*, 499.

Shortly after the publication of this letter, it was criticised with great ability by Archdeacon Blackburne, a very eminent divine of latitudinarian views, who opposed the establishment of an episcopate in America chiefly on political grounds, but who went carefully over the several positions of Archbishop Secker and made them the subject of the most searching scrutiny. It is important to note the manner in which the Archbishop's statement in refer-

ence to the Moravian succession is treated. There is no attempt to deny the validity of that succession, or the fact of its preöccupancy of the ground. The retort, however, is,—"you prove too much for your own purpose. Instead of the establishment of the Moravian episcopate being an argument in *favor* of the introduction of an Anglican episcopate, it is an argument *against* it, for by the doctrine of the Nicene council, the first occupant absorbs the urisdiction." Or to give the Archdeacon's own words:—

"But supposing the Moravian Bishops to be expressly established in America, and to have all the prelatical powers with which our English Bishops are invested, what is the consequence? A very unfortunate one for his grace's project, if Mr. Rimius is to be believed, who when he wanted to exclude the Moravian Bishops from exercising their functions in England, confronted them with a canon of the Nicene Council, which enjoins that two Bishops shall not preside together in the same city. The Moravian Bishops, according to this doctrine have a canonical title by preoccupation, and the English Bishops must be excluded of course from America, on the pain of being censured as uncanonical interlopers."

But Archdeacon Blackburne's arguments on this point were not destined to remain unanswered. High Churchmen in those days did not believe in those doctrines of preöccupancy which are flaunted on the banners of modern Anglo-Catholicism. Independently of this it was not to be permitted to a latitudinarian divine to make flings at the discipline of so ancient and apostolic a church as the Moravian. Archbishop Secker, it is true, was then silenced by death, but there were others whose characters were equally unimpeachable who were ready to maintain both the purity of the Moravian succession, and the absurdity of the doctrine of the exclusive right of the preöccupant. Among these champions not the least eminent and able was the Rev. Dr. Chandler, of Elizabethtown, who will be again referred to, as the especial representative of the then high Anglican party in this country, and who was shortly afterwards selected for consecration in case the English episcopal line should be then extended to America. In a pamphlet published by him in New York in 1774, he not only earnestly vindicates the validity of the Moravian episcopate, but rejects with the most marked contempt the notion that one regular episcopate can by preöccupancy exclude another.

The contrast between the then high church view and the present will be abundantly shown by the following paragraph in his argument.

"The Count had Episcopal consecration at Siffa, in Great Noland, in the year 1737, and the Bishop Jablonski, of Berlin, the Polish Bishop Sitgravius, and the Moravian Bishop Jacob Mitschmann, were the persons

that ordained him. From them he received every branch of Episcopal power, and was known to exercise it to its utmost extent, and without control, when the favors of the British Parliament were granted him. Indeed, he had pretended to lay down his Episcopal dignity a few years after he had received it; but instead of it he assumed the higher title and superior power of Minister Plenipotentiary and Oeconomist, and afterwards of Lord Advocate of the Unitas frataum. And if ecclesiastical discipline was not immediately administered by him, yet it was administered with the strictest severity according to his orders and directions, who was the absolute sovereign of this Moravian fraternity. In a word, let any one read the candid narrative, or any other faithful account of the constitution of this society, and he will find that their discipline is exercised with the utmost strictness and with uncontrollable severity; that the discipline of the Church of England is not comparable with it in this respect; and the Commentator, by pretending to prove the contrary, expose himself and injures the cause he has undertaken to support.

"As to what he (Archdeacon Blackburne) advances *concerning a canon of the Nicene Council, and the right of the Moravian Bishops to the Episcopal jurisdiction of America by preoccupation*, p. 53; *no reader can be so weak as to think it deserves an answer.*"

The records of the English Parliament,—which voluminous as they are, can hardly be supposed will forever be out of the reach of the "child" who is instructed by the New York Society,—show how careful was the investigation upon which this recognition proceeded. Prominent among them will be found "the Report of the Committee to whom the petition of the deputies of the United Moravian churches was referred," and of which an adequate supply of pamphlet copies are still to be found under the London impress of 1749. This Report, which was read in the house by Lieutenant-General Oglethorpe,—an honored name both in Church and State,—contained the following vouchers,—among many others,—of the validity of the Moravian succession which were declared to have been duly proved, and were ordered to be printed.

A certificate from Bishop Jablousky, of the Polish Church, whose succession is proved by a careful historical scrutiny, of his participation in the Moravian consecrations.—(p. 6, app. pp. 12, 13.)

A statement of Archbishop Wray, recognizing the same as valid.—(*Ibid.*)

A report of the Propagation Society to the same effect.—(p. 7, app. p. 11.)

A letter from Archbishop Potter to the same effect.—(p. 8.)

A letter patent from the Patriarch Neophytus of Constantinople (1740) to the same effect.—(p. 17, app. p. 35.)

Two letters from Samuel, Archbishop of Dercon, to the same effect.—(p. 17, app. p. 34.)

A list of ancient and modern authors to the same effect.—(p. 17, app. p. 97.)

Letters patent of Edward VI. to the same effect.—(app. p. 44.)

It was on this evidence that the bill for "establishing" (to use Archbishop Secker's language) the Moravian Episcopate in this country passed Parliament.

It will be seen, therefore, that by a Parliamentary recognition of the Moravian Church as a valid Episcopal communion here existing prior to our own Episcopal occupancy, we are not only judicially excluded from disputing Moravian priority, but, that that very priority, though without attaching to it any of the prerogatives our New York brethren claim, was recognized by Archbishop Secker in England, and by the acknowledged leader of the High Church interest in this country. We should be doing injustice, however, did we stop here. All classes of Anglican divines hurried to pay the tribute of their salutation to the validity of the Moravian succession and the purity of the Moravian doctrine. Dr. Sherlock, then Bishop of London, and ordinary of the American provinces, sent in to the King in council a memorial on the subject of the importance of an American Episcopate, in which he urges the fact of a prior and valid Moravian occupancy as a chief reason for immediate action. One paragraph we quote:

"The churches of the Episcopal communion abroad have been under a necessity of submitting to these difficulties. For as *Protestant*, they would not apply to Popish Bishops for confirmation or orders; and as Episcopal churches they could resort for orders only to English or Irish Bishops. *But since the Moravians have been recognized by Parliament to be a Protestant Episcopal Church, and have liberty to settle in his Majesty's American dominions*, should the churches abroad admit of ordination by Moravian Bishops, it might be attended with consequences not easily foreseen, but easily prevented by suffering the Episcopal churches of England in America to have one or more suffragan Bishops residing among them."

And then we have a formal and official letter not only of recognition but of endorsement from Archbishop Potter, then Archbishop of Canterbury, to Count Zinzendorf, on the consecration of the latter, in which the Moravian Church is declared to steadfastly maintain "pure and primitive faith" and "primitive discipline." (See Biographia Britanica, *in loco.*) We give the whole of this Episcopal precept in the original Latin in which, in due accordance with patristic usage, it was expressed:

"Viro admodum Reverendo, Domino Nicolao Ludovico Moraviensi Episcopo, Joannes Cantuariensis, S. P. D.

"Sanctam illam vereque illustrem (quibuscunque forte tenebris jam sit involuta) Moraviensem Cathedram, ad quam, favente Divino Numine, plaudente cœlesti Choro (id enim dubitare nos haud sinit quam de te concepimus, opinio) nuper es evectus, sincere atque ex intimo corde gratulor. Qui tibi haud sine eximio merito delatus honos, ut Ecclesiæ falutaris sit,

nec tibi tuisve unquam pœnitendus, ardenti prece contendo. Hoc enim fastigio, quo divina me Providentia, utcunque imparem constituit, penitus essem indignus, nisi me universo Dei populo pro virili opem ferre semper exhiberem paratum; vos autem præ cœteris amem atque amplectar, qui nec periculus territi, nec aliis quibusvis Satanæ ἰερασμοῖς seducti, una cum pura primævaque fide, primævam etiam Ecclesiæ disciplinam, constanter adhuc, ut accepimus, tuentes, arctiori nobiscum vinculo conjuncti estis. Precibus me tuis, oro, vicissim adjuves. Co-episcopis antem tuis, totique, cui, te Deus præesse voluit, Christiano gregi, salutem nomine meo impertias. Vale!

"Dabam Westmonasterii IV. Id. Augusti MDCCXXXVII."—(*See report of Commons Committee*, 1749, p. 9.)

And, as if to close the matter against American cavil, Bishop White, in a letter dated April 24, 1804, writes to Bishop Hobart: "Besides the Episcopal Church in England, Scotland, and the United States, I know of no other than the Romish, the Swedish, the Danish, and the MORAVIAN. I presume that the Moravian succession can be fairly made out; otherwise I think it would never have received the sanction of Archbishop Potter and the other Bishops, at the time of passing the act encouraging the settlement of that people in the colonies of a people called 'Unitas Fratrum.'"—(Memoirs of Bishop White, 387.)

And Bishop Seabury, at a period when he is in full exercise of his Episcopal jurisdiction, thus writes to Dr. Smith: "We have (not *had*) in America the Church of MORAVIA, and why not of ENGLAND?" The *statement* shows his recognition of the *fact;* the *enquiry* his rejection of the tractarian *inference.*

From the above summary it will be seen that the very first steps taken by the English Church towards the transfer of their succession to our shores show how far they were from claiming any right of priority over other reformed churches. In point of fact they recognized the Moravian Church as having a duly constituted episcopacy,—of being possessed of both primitive discipline and primitive doctrine,—and as having already in our midst whatever rights episcopal preöccupancy could give. They did this in the most solemn way which was in their power. They passed an act of Parliament for the purpose. Two successive Archbishops of Canterbury, with the then Bishop of London, took the initiative as became their station, in the official recognition of the validity and orthodoxy of the Church thus established within our borders. It will be seen from this alone how suicidal is the policy which declares, as does the New York Book Society, that all second Episcopates are schismatic, for ourselves can never, in face of the solemn admissions of our own predecessors, claim to be anything else but second to the Moravians. And what is more, it

will be seen how at variance with our own history,—at variance with primitive usage Bishop Hopkins has lately well shown it to be,—is the position here so conspicuously announced, that there can be but "one Bishop in one diocese." Acquitting the New York Society.—as we most cheerfully do,—of all sinister design of flirting by this passage a side blot on the papers of Bishop Wainwright or Bishop Gobat, it is impossible not to see that a "child's" knowledge of history must be very limited not to enable him at once to see that what he is here made to say is this: "The P. E. Church in this country, to which I belong, is no Church at all, but schismatical, &c., since its Bishops were but second in occupation to the Moravians, whose episcopate it has duly acknowledged to be valid." It will not, under such a state of facts, be disrespectful to hold up to the New York Society for avoidance the example of that very foolish bird, which occupies itself with hatching eggs, whose occupants when old enough, will drive it with contumely from its own nest. With a zeal whose purity no one disputes, but with knowledge not equally perfect, they have unconsciously seized upon the Moravian episcopate as the subject of incubation, to the eminent risk of the flock of votaries they themselves have collected with such sedulous care. If the framers of our church policy were to be permitted to address the functionaries who are engaged in this questionable species of ecclesiastical propagation, they would not improbably admonish them of the danger of thus nursing elements which must be destructive to themselves, and advancing theories before they are acquainted with the facts on which they rest. And if this advice remained unheeded —if they still insist in applying their energies to thus dismantling their own church,—moderate churchmen of the old fashioned stamp must respectfully request that they do so under their own name. If concessions fatal to our own church must be made, let the voluntary society that chooses to make them at least drop from future publications the title "general," and the names of the non-consenting President and Vice-Presidents, whom it now parades as substantial proclaimers of the nullity of their own Episcopal orders.

But we must return to the direct bearing of the Moravian recognition upon this immediate question, and presume that we will run little hazard of contradiction when we say that the action of the Anglican Church in this respect if it proves nothing more, proves that at least no exclusive privileges were then claimed for our communion in this country, such as those now set up.

But this is not all. When the managers of the "Church Book Society" search—as their duty will compel them to do as vigilant

conservators of our historical literature,—the records of the negotiations which preceded the constitution of our own episcopate,—they will see how very chary was the English Church of infringing in any way on the prerogatives of the other reformed churches of the colonies. Thus in the annual episcopal sermons on the importance of an American Episcopate, which were delivered before the Propagation Society, from 1767 to 1770, and which were afterwards published as exhibiting the views of the English hierarchy in this respect, we find that the term "church" is indiscriminately applied to what our New York guides call "sects," and the term "sect," to what they call "the church." One or two extracts will show to what extent these epithets were interchanged, and will point out to our New York cotemporaries how difficult it will be for the children for whom the catechism before us is designed, when they come to read history, to discover which is the "church" of which the catechism speaks so highly, and which is the "sect."

"All *sects* of Protestant Christians here at home; and all, *save one*, throughout our colonies, have the full enjoyment of their religion. Thus stands the case of all *Churches* in our colonies, except only the *Church*, here by law established."—*Bishop of Bangor*, 1767.

"Now while all *other sects* can provide for the complete administration of *sacred* offices *our* Church in the colonies is laid under peculiar discouragement," &c.—*Bishop of Lincoln*, 1768.

"Shall all *other* sectaries enjoy their particular privileges and forms of worship in their full latitude, and at the same time the members of the national Church be debarred," &c.—*Bishop of Bristol*, 1769.

"Without presuming on the superior excellence and credit of the Church of England, and on its being the established religion of the mother Country, we might at least, hope for *equal* indulgence with *others*, &c.—*Bishop of Exeter*, 1770.

"Their (American Episcopalians) situations and circumstances deprive them of the common benefit, which *all Christian Churches*, in all ages. and in every part of the world, have freely enjoyed, and *which*" (i. e. church integrity,") in those countries, Christians of every *other* denomination do at this time *freely* enjoy."—*Bishop of Oxford*, 1771.

"The time, we hope, is not far distant, when this obstruction shall be removed, and no longer remain a blemish and reproach to the most extensive and respectable of all the *Reformed Churches*."—*Bishop of St. Davids*, 1772.

Such is the official language used by the series of English Bishops selected by the Propagation Society between 1767 and 1772, to express the views of the Society, or in other words of the Episcopal bench, as to the relations of "the church" and the "sects." Unless we attribute to these eminent prelates a degree of mental prostration on the entire subject which made them incapable of intelligent expression,—and an hypothesis like this, however con-

sistent with the Bishop of Exeter's method of disciplining his metropolitan, will surely find no advocates in our more moderate regions,—we can draw from their language but one conclusion, and that is that they applied both to our own and the other protestant communions indiscriminately the terms "church" and "sect" so that each party was at one and the same time though in different relations, both "sect" and "church."

In a moment, it will be seen that the same liberality of nomenclature was not only pursued by Dr. Seabury and Dr. Chandler, the two leading high church divines in this country, but that the *principle* involved in such liberality was at least to a considerable extent justified by the latter in an elaborate defence to an accusation made against him of taking opposite views.

One very striking fact, however, may at this point be noticed.

The establishment in this country of the Anglican line was as we all know the darling project of Archbishop Secker. It was ever by him, whether Rector of St. James', as Bishop of Bristol, or as Archbishop of Canterbury. If constant longing for an object is apt to produce an exaggerated view of its importance, such must have been the case with himself in his estimate of an American episcopate, for it was never out of his heart. If exalted notions of the importance of Episcopacy, and positiveness of assurance of its apostolic origin, constitute sound Churchmanship, then a sound Churchman was Archbishop Secker, in the just sense of the term. From him, therefore, are we to expect, in this respect, exclusive "church" views, and if they did not come from him, the conclusion is that they are not to be found. And when we learn that his favorite scheme was opposed the most bitterly by the New England Congregationalists and Independents, we can easily see that their ecclesiastical status furnished a test, which like an Artesian well as to water, was so deep and probing that if it failed to bring up what are now called "church views" would satisfactorily prove that there were no "church views" to come. Had he thought similarly to the authors of the catechism before us, he would readily have said:—"No, these sectaries are not even Christians, their ministers are not even laymen, we must in the very lowest view treat them as nullities." But he was far from doing this. Regarding these protestant communions as valid churches, he actually took the ground that it would be improper to interpose another organization in their midst without their consent, for in his celebrated letter to Mr. Walpole, which after his death was republished under his testamentary directions, he said "whether they" (the non-Episcopalians of New England,) "would object against Bishops coming occasionally to officiate amongst those of

the *Episcopal persuasion*" (another instance of the obtuseness of our church fathers to Anglo-Catholic nomenclature,) "in that province I know not. If they should, and persist in it—*that* may be omitted."* In fact he proposed to treat the "schismatic" ministers of New England with the same obsequiousness and reverential courtesy which our Anglo-Catholic cotemporaries bestow upon those questionable worthies the Greek Bishops,—i. e., look at them with reverence at a distance—send them over an Episcopal messenger with a letter expressive of high esteem,—and then withdraw. To our own minds the course of both is improper. We conceive ourselves at liberty to propagate Gospel truth and to establish sound Church government wherever we please, and we mean to do each in the proper season when we believe ourselves impelled to do so by a sense of duty. But be this as it may, the tractarian divines of the present day, who have been for so long performing their obeisance at the Greek Shrine will no doubt feel a little puzzled when on turning back the pages of history they discover Archbishop Secker engaged in the same polite ceremonies before the "church" of New England. And when they have attentively examined the record of this remarkable fact, they will, it is to be hoped, acknowledge that the exclusive church theory was not taken by us from our putative parent, but is at best of individual and recent origin.

But is it sanctioned by our own early American Bishops and by those by whom our distinctive formulas were constructed? And here we emerge from the underbrush of Anglican polemics, and enter upon an open and beaten track with which our readers are already familiar. It is fortunate, indeed, for the perpetuity of the true church theory, that Bishop White should have united within himself qualities which render his testimony as unmistakeable as to its meaning, as it is conclusive in its results. Whatever may be the degree in which the motives, the consistency, or the influence of others may be questioned, on his no shadow can rest. For a very long period—a period of extraordinary license of public and private criticism—he was exposed to minute and continuous scrutiny, and alone among his cotemporaries does he appear before us invested with an integrity and purity both of purpose and life which were never even doubted. And independently of this, if his equal and passionless judgment was capable of any partizan bias, it certainly would not have been warped in the Low Church direction. His personal associations as well as his party sympathies were all with the High Church organization, and as

* 6 Secker's Works, 502.

his biographer tells us, he regarded the machinery of the evangelical reaction of 1825-8, with anxiety and doubt. His continued adhesion to Low Church views in the abstract, therefore, must be regarded as a testimony of his judgment, as distinguished from his inclinations, and as such, is entitled to peculiar weight. That his adhesion to these principles was unquestioned and unwavering, appears from the following statement of Dr. Wilson, his selected biographer. "Dr. White formed his theological views, after full examination, and on clear conviction, upon the model of those of the Low Church divines—as they are called in England—of the established Church in that country." How far these views went we now proceed to show, taking for our standard, not those of his writings which are more familiar to the general reader, but a very remarkable pamphlet now out of print, which had the peculiar sanction of having been prepared by him before his entrance on the Episcopate for the purpose of exhibiting the views of the American Church, and of having been deliberately endorsed by him from time to time down to the period when the Episcopal staff so long and so wisely wielded by him was at last broken in death.

In 1780-2, as is well known, the Episcopal Church in this country was in a state of great depression from the fact that by the *political* severance from the mother country, there had been an *ecclesiastical* severance which left our communion in about the same condition as would be the Presbyterian, if by a single sweep the entire body of Presbyters had been removed. It became a very serious question what could be done. There seemed then no chance of obtaining through the English succession the establishment of an independent American Episcopate. The alternatives were the renewal of the system of dependence on a foreign Episcopate, something on the same principle as obtains in the Church of Rome; or the construction of a new Church by the election and self-consecration of an independent ordaining power. It was at the close of this period that Bishop White, then a parish minister in Philadelphia, published a pamphlet entitled "The case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States Considered," which he tells us embodied the joint views of himself and Bishop Provoost, and was submitted as such to the Archbishop of Canterbury, at the more fortunate period when with the assent of the English government, they were about to receive Episcopal orders. In this pamphlet, which it is to be regretted is now out of popular reach, after assuming that the direct connection with the Anglican Church, was indissolubly severed, and that the obtaining of the

succession for an independent Episcopate was for the time impracticable, the following scheme of organization was proposed:

"In each smaller district there should be elected a general vestry or convention, consisting of a convenient number (the minister to be one) from the vestry or congregation of each Church, or of every two or more churches, according to their respective ability of supporting a minister. They should elect a clergyman their permanent president; who in conjunction with other clergymen to be also appointed by the body, may exercise such powers as are purely spiritual, particularly that of admitting to the ministry; the presiding clergyman and others to be liable to be deprived for just causes, by a fair process, and under reasonable laws; meetings to be held as often as occasion may require.

"The assemblies in the three larger districts may consist of a convenient number of members, sent from each of the smaller districts severally within their bounds, equally composed of clergy and laity, and voted for by those orders promiscuously; the presiding clergyman to be always one, and these bodies to meet once in every year.

"The continental representative body may consist of a convenient number from each of the larger districts, formed equally of clergy and laity, and among the clergy formed equally of presiding ministers and others; to meet statedly once in three years. The use of this and the preceding representative bodies is to make such regulations, and receive appeals in such matters only, as shall be judged necessary for their continuing one religious communion."

The time for the immediate establishment of such a system is thus considered:

"The other part of the proposal was an immediate execution of the plan, without waiting for the episcopal succession. This is founded on the presumption, that the worship of God and the instruction and reformation of the people are the principal objects of ecclesiastical discipline; if so to relinquish them from a scrupulous adherence to episcopacy, is sacrificing the substance to the ceremony."

The main difficulty in the way of the practical adoption of the plan, however, was the very one which is stated in the catechism before us, viz.: that a voluntary episcopacy without the succession would be a nullity. This position is refuted with great force and fulness in an argument from which we have only space to extract the following passages:

"It would be to the greater degree surprising if the Church of England, acknowledged by all protestant churches to lay a sufficient stress on episcopal succession afterwards obtained, any supposed imperfections of the intermediate ordinations might, if it were judged proper be supplied without acknowledging their nullity, by a conditional ordination resembling that of conditional baptism in the liturgy; the above was an expedient proposed by Archbishop Tillotson, Bishops Patrick, Stillingfleet and others, at the revolution, and had been actually practised in Ireland by Archbishop Bramhall.

"It will be said, we ought to continue as we are, with the hope of ob-

taining it hereafter. But are the acknowledged ordinances of Christ's holy religion to be suspended for years perhaps as long as the present generation shall continue, out of delicacy to a disputed point, and that relating only to externals? It is submitted, how far such ideas encourage the suspicion of want of attachment to any particular church, except so far as is subservient to some civil system. All the obligations of conformity to the divine ordinances, all the argument which prove the connection between public worship and the morals of the people, combine to urge the adopting some speedy measures to provide for the public ministry in these churches; if such as have been above recommended should be adopted, and the essential doctrines and duties of the gospel, should be so immoderately attached to *a matter of external order, as must in some cases be ruinous to her communion,*" *p.* 20.

"Can any reasonable rule of instruction make this (Episcopacy) amount to more than ancient and apostolic practice? That the apostles adopted any particular form, affords a presumption of its being the best, all circumstances at that time considered; but to make it unalterably binding, it must be shown enjoined in positive precept," p. 24.

Then after showing that even the High Church school of English divines did not unchurch non-episcopal denominations, comes the following summary:

"Now if even those who held episcopacy, to be of divine right, conceive the obligation to it to be most binding when that idea would be destructive of public worship, much more must they think so, who indeed venerate and prefer that form as the most ancient and eligible, without any idea of the divine right in the case. This, the author believes to be the sentiment of the great body of Episcopalians in America; in which respect they have in their favor unquestionably the sense of the Church of England, and as he believes the opinion of her most distinguished prelates for piety, virtues, and abilities." p. 28.

In substance we have here set forth the two following positions which if put in the shape of questions and answers, would form a contrast with the New York catechism, about as striking as that between tractarian views now, and sound church views of older days:

(1.) In point of fact our own church existed *as a church* without episcopacy for at least six years, and in the opinion of her founders could have continued to do so, without detriment to her integrity, had the English succession been refused:

(2.) In point of doctrine Bishop White and Provoost not only considered episcopal succession inessential to the existence of a church, but believed that in case of political necessity episcopacy could be started by self-consecration.

The theoretic portion at least of these opinions it is well known was shared by Dr. Wharton and Dr. Smith, from whom the present preface to the Prayer Book emanated, and whose views can be therefore taken in aid of its construction. Bishop Madison's views,

it is well understood, were at least equally liberal. And that Bishop White adhered in his other writings to the positions thus expressed is evident from the following passages:

"We may freely confess, (it agreeing with their conduct in a variety of ways) that in laying down articles of faith, (the Reformers) had no design of condemning other Protestant churches on points of discipline." —*Lectures on the Catechism, page* 157.

"I am engaged in opening and defending the sense of the Episcopal Church as received from the Church of England, at the same time that, in point of fact, she decidedly set her feet on the ground of the apostolic origin of episcopacy, she carefully avoided passing a judgment on the validity of the ministry of the churches."—*Ibid, page* 174.

„The deliverer of this present charge, in the exercise of like freedom of opinion, is rather disposed to adopt the sentiments of an able and learned Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Wake) where he says in a letter to an eminent foreign divine,—far be from me such an obdurate heart, as that because of this defect (the want of episcopacy), I should say of some churches that they are to be cut off from our communion, or should pronounce, with over ardent writers among us, they have no valid sacraments, and are scarcely Christians. Many English prelates may be cited to the same effect."—*Charge*, 1834, *page* 15.

But Bishop Seabury, we will be told, "thought differently, and therefore think differently must we." Only a slight examination, however, is necessary of Bishop Seabury's course and authority to show that on the main principle involved he is at issue with those who rely on him so sturdily.

In 1771, a committee of the clergy of New York and New Jersey, addressed a letter to the "Episcopalians of Virginia" for the purpose of inducing the latter to withdraw from their opposition to the establishment of an American episcopate which the laity throughout the colonies looked upon with much dread from its supposed political associations. The committee consisted entirely of what were then called "High-Flyers," viz: high tories and high churchmen who allowed themselves to be surpassed by none in devotion to the church and the crown.—Among their names we find Dr. Chandler, who was designated by the Propagation Society for the Diocese of New York, and Dr. Seabury, who afterwards became the choice of the clergy for the Connecticut Episcopate. Of course from such a quarter we would have exclusive views if such views existed anywhere.

We quote one or two passages from the letter in question to show that even by them exclusive views were not within the range of contemplation:

"The request for such an episcopate as the society had proposed, amounted, in reality, to no more than the toleration of our church in the colonies, or to its having a full existence as an *ecclesiastical society*;

and would only raise it to an equality of privileges with other tolerated churches.—with the *Moravians* and papists, for instance, who are allowed to have Bishops on a claim certainly not superior to ours."—*Page* 47.

"Such a tax, we believe, has never been imposed upon the candidates of *any other* church in the christian world; and no church but ours would have remained so long patient and silent under the load of it,—especially *in a country wherein all other churches* are allowed the means of providing for themselves, in this respect, in the easiest and cheapest manner."—*Page* 47.

"If our church is not desirous of Bishops, it is not Episcopal; if it desires Bishops, but cannot obtain them, its condition is worse than that of *all other churches in the colonies*, which enjoy all the privileges they desire, or to which they have any reasonable pretensions. If it is not Episcopal, it is now no branch of the Church of England; *for to that Church Bishops* are essential."—*Page* 55.

But liberal as was the language of the foregoing and other papers, the non-episcopal communions took fire on the ground that though they were to be conceded to be "churches" yet the term "THE" church was exclusively assumed by the Anglican communion. To meet this and other criticisms Dr. Chandler, as the especial champion of the northern High church clergy, issued a pamphlet dated in 1774, in which occurs the following pointed paragraph:

"The author, in his appeal and its Defences, whenever he speaks of the church or the clergy, without distinction, is known always to mean the Church of England only, and the clergy of that church. In his opinion, within the kingdom of England and its colonies, which he considers as territories thereunto belonging, the established church of the nation may with propriety be called the church, by way of emphasis, and her clergy the clergy. *Nor does this mode of expression imply an opinion that there are no other churches or clergy in the kingdom; any more than speaking of London under the title of the city would imply an opinion that there were no other cities in the kingdom.*"—*Page* 92.

And as late as 1785, when Bishop Seabury was in the full exercise of his episcopal jurisdiction, he thus writes to Dr. Smith:

"We have in America, the Church of Scotland, of Sweden, of Moravia, and why not of England? *Our* (showing that by thus severing himself from the 'Church of Scotland' be recognized under that title the *non*-episcopal, not the episcopal communion under that name) *being the Church of England no more implies dependence on or subjection to England, than being the church of Holland implies subjection to Holland.*" —*White's Memoirs, page* 287.

Here we have the Scotch and Dutch Calvinistic non-episcopal communions recognized as *churches*, and this after the succession had been planted in Bishop Seabury's own person on our shores.

It is plain therefore that neither Dr. Seabury nor Dr. Chandler unchurched "other denominations," and it is also plain, for it is a

matter of undisputed history, that they constituted the extreme high church wing of the northern clergy. Whatever *they* rejected, therefore, would of course be still more indignantly repudiated by the "low church" or "moderate" section, of whom Dr. Provoost, afterwards elected Bishop, was the head. It is true that afterwards, Dr. Seabury, when he found himself depending for his episcopal orders on the Scotch chain, which was regarded by the English Archbishops as of but doubtful validity, assumed that swell which is the general accompaniment of an uneasy title, and imitated those from whom his orders were derived in the exhibition of an ecclesiastical heraldry which was probably the more conspicuously flaunted from the consciousness of the bar sinister which was supposed to cross it. But his pretensions were those of manner rather than substance, and after allowing the margin his insecure position requires, they are not entirely inconsistent with his own prior recognition of the "churchship" of the non-episcopal communions. Dr. Seabury's authority, therefore, like detonating powder, has only to be struck to explode from the hostility of its own materials. But even if it were not so, it will be recollected that he is an appendage, not an ingredient of our own succession, and is no more a staple of it, affecting it by his admissions, than was Mar Johannes, the Armenian Bishop, who when on his visit to this country was placed in several of our State Conventions in the Episcopal chair by the side of the Presiding Bishop. Both Bishop White and Bishop Provoost positively refused to join in any consecration with him until a third Bishop arrived from England, when Bishop Seabury's presence, by becoming unessential, would become inocuous. When in England he found that the Archbishop of Canterbury not only declined to sanction his own orders, but requested that he should not be concerned in American consecrations thereafter. Respectable, enlightened, and devout as he was, he can therefore in no wise be considered as an authority of great weight either on this or any other question on which the opinions of the *founders* of our church policy are material.

(8.) *Pastoral letters.*

When it is remembered that "pastoral letters" are drawn and uttered for the purpose of conveying to the church the sense of the House of Bishops on the main points of Christian doctrine, the only way of accounting for their uniform silence on the subject of the spiritual necessity of a succession, is by the hypothesis that that right reverend body did not believe a technical succession necessary at all. The very fact of silence, therefore, is sufficient for our present purpose. In addition to this, however, we call attention to one or two particular passages:

In the letter of 1838 it is declared:

"The spirit of meekness, and of benevolence, and of liberality, truly so called, is remarkably manifest in the deliberations of our church; and happy will it be if all its members imbibe this spirit, equally free from enthusiasm, bigotry and superstition.

"It is not necessary to true charity, (though much to be desired,) that Christians should be in everything of one mind; nor that all should be of the same denomination. We may live as brethren, though as such we do not commune together in all the ordinances of Christ. But to be truly his disciples, it is neccessary we should love those who love him. It is a profitable and pleasing exercise of charity to view with compassion the errors and mistakes of pious, well-meaning people, and to love those who love the same Saviour and worship the same God. When we consider that numbers among us scoff at all religion, and how many professing to be Christians reject what we esteem to be the essential doctrines of Christ, make his cross of none effect, and how many others have disfigured the truth and simplicity of the gospel by the inventions of man, they who happily agree in what is essential should delight in cultivating love and living as brethren, not permitting strifes of words and questions of expediency to disunite them. These are the pious words of the Apostolic Griswold."

In the pastoral letter written by Bishop White of 1823, occurs the following:

"It is no small addition to the satisfaction of being at peace among ourselves, that we are on terms of good neighborhood and Christian sympathy with our fellow Christians of other denominations. The wisest and most christian course that can be pursued by us, is to conduct the concerns of our church agreeably to its matured and long existing institutions, and under the sense of responsibility to its divine head; but without reference to others, professing to worship the same God, through the merits of the same Redeemer, except to put the most favorable construction on their acts, to rejoice in any good resulting from them, and scrupulously to avoid whatever may have a tendency to excite angry passions, either in them or in ourselves."

(9.) *Usage.*

The history of the French Huguenots in this country demonstrates how gladly their non-episcopal ordination was recognized and adopted by the Bishop of London and the Propagation Society. Eminent indeed were their services in the cause of Christ in their native land, and hardly less eminent were these services on our own shores. The uniformity act, and the consequent alterations in our ordinal, prevented, it is true, any further official action by the parties so ordained *in* the Established Church without reordination, just in the same way that our Federal Constitution, as has been already observed, upon the same principle of proper individuality, declares that naturalization and abjuration of foreign allegiance, shall be necessary to constitute citizenship here. But

the validity of these foreign orders, so far as concerns their own churches is no more affected by the uniformity act than is the validity of foreign allegiance so far as concerns foreign governments, affected by our national constitution. The *principle* is thus stated by Bishop Cosin, a leading high church participant in the then controversies, in a letter dated at Paris, Feb. 7, 1650:

"Therefore if at any time a minister so ordained in these French Churches came to incorporate himself in ours, and to receive a public charge or cure of souls among us in the Church of England (as I have known some of them to have so done of late, and can instance in many other before my time,) *our bishops did not reordain him before they admitted him to his charge, as they must have done, if his former ordination here in France had been void.* NOR DID OUR LAWS REQUIRE MORE OF HIM THAN TO DECLARE HIS PUBLIC CONSENT TO THE RELIGION RECEIVED AMONGST US, AND TO SUBSCRIBE THE ARTICLES ESTABLISHED.—(Letter to Mr. Cordel, in Basire's 'Account of Bishop Cosin,' annexed to his 'Funeral Sermon:' and also in Bishop Fleetwood's *Judgment of the Church of England in the case of Lay Baptism*, 2d ed. Lond. 1712, p. 52.)"

"To the same effect Bishop Fleetwood says that this was 'certainly her practice [i. e. of our Church] during the reigns of King James and Charles I. and to the year 1661. We had many visitors from Scotland, from France, and the Low Countries, who were ordained by presbyters only, and not bishops, and they were instituted into benefices with cure . . . and yet were never reordained, but only subscribed the Articles.' (*Judgment of Church of England in case of Lay Baptism*, 1712. 8vo. pt. ii. *Works*, p. 552.)"

It is well known as a matter of history, that the Propagation Society, of which the Anglican Bishops are ex-officio governors, and with which we are always so prompt to boast our relationship and sympathy, commissioned for a long series of years Lutheran missionaries to India and Africa.

What the state of sentiment in England now is, outside of the tractarian camp, may be judged from the following recent letter of the Archbishop of Canterbury, whose equal temper and unimpassioned judgment make him at least an unimpeachable witness as to facts:—

"SIR: You are far too severe in your censure of the Bishop of London, though I wish that his Lordship had explained himself more fully. But in his original letter to Lord Cholmondeley, he *expressly* stated that *they could not by law minister in our churches*, but that every endeavor would be made to provide places where they might celebrate Divine worship according to their own form. I hardly imagine that there are two Bishops on the bench, or one clergyman in fifty throughout our Church, who would deny the validity of the orders of those Pastors solely on account of their wanting the imposition of Episcopal hands; and I am sure that you have misunderstood the import of the letter which occasioned your addressing

me, if you suppose that it implied any such sentiment in the writer's mind.

"I remain, sir, your obedient and humble servant,

"W. FRANCIS, Esq. J. B. CANTUAR."

Nor even if Archbishop Sumner's testimony is thrown out is the case varied, for his high-church predecessor, Archbishop Howley, speaks practically to the same purpose. Thus in a letter to Bishop White from Dr. Hawks, in which the latter details an interview with Archbishop Howley in 1836, we learn that the Archbishop said, "I am very happy to hear of the prosperity of the —— Episcopal Church in America; I was going to say of *the Church*, for such (it may be from my old fashioned notions,) I cannot help considering her. I *do not mean to say that those without episcopacy are not churches, but they are irregular ones, by their departure from primitive usage.*" Life of Bishop White, 260.

In a statement published by the same staunch authority in 1841, the Foreign Protestant Non-Episcopal Churches are spoken of as "the less perfectly constituted of the Protestant Churches of Europe." *(Statem. resp. Jerusalem Bishopric*, p. 5.*)*

In 1835, a letter was addressed by the same Prelate, in the name of himself and his "*brother bishops*," to "the Moderator of the Company of Pastors at Geneva," expressing their "*high respect for the Protestant Churches on the Continent*," and speaking of the *Genevan Reformation* as a "noble achievement, which brought light out of darkness, and rescued your Church from the shackles of Papal domination and the tyrannical imposition of a corrupt faith, and a superstitious ritual," wrought by "illustrious men, who, under the direction of Almighty God, were the instruments of this happy deliverance," "an event not less glorious to Geneva than conducive to the success of the Reformation."

(10.) *Hymns.*

'Hymns,' to paraphrase one of Talleyrand's maxims, 'are the creeds of the heart;' and while more precise and more elaborate symbols define the faith of the student, that of the young and the simple receives from them an impress which often continues through life. The child never forgets even if he can reject the theology of the little hymn which first kindled divine love in his heart, or of the short prayer in which he first expressed his consciousness of sin. Mr. Maurice intimates that it is vain to attempt to introduce 'broad' views of eternity into England as long as there remains embedded in the English heart that awful couplet by which Watts has given to so many a mind its first shock as to the terrific consequences of sin:

"'There's no repentance in the grave,
Nor pardon offered to the dead.'

Nor is this moral power of our hymns without a corresponding technical authority. They are last, and consequently most authoritative expositions of our practical theology, for whatever may be the ecclesiological notion in this respect, it is the last adjudication of a court that binds. And even if this proposition be discarded as inconsistent with just reverence for partristic myths, no one will certainly dispute the principle that the formula which the supreme government of the Church considers so sacred as to be entitled to be placed in its hymns of prayer and praise, has received all the weight which it is possible for ecclesiastical authority to impart.

In one respect our hymns possess a feature which renders their doctrinal exposition comparatively easy. No one will dispute that it is a cardinal principle of interpretation that all instruments, theological as well as legal, are to receive the obvious and natural construction attached to them when framed, so far as it is common to the party issuing and the party receiving them; and to determine this there is no more certain test than the intention of the author. Unlike our liturgy, the fountains of which have now been buried among the ruins of ages, and whose individual framers would hardly be able to recognize their offspring in what the Tractarian calls its 'maimed and inarticulate' state, our hymns have been extracted sometimes entire, sometimes with verbal alterations only, either from the works of authors by whose vocabulary they can be translated, or from general depositories in which they have received a settled Catholic construction. And here it may be remarked that if in this way doctrinal affinities may be determined, the drift of our Church is unmistakeable. In spite of the assertion that she has always been studiously steering a course equi-distant from the headlands of Rome and Geneva, the one a heretic Church and the other a Church-heresy; in spite of the earnest cry lest she soil herself by the commerce even of ordinary civilities with either, it is plain if a critical examination be instituted, that she will be found to have drawn, in the only case when she had the power of selection, almost her entire body of practical theology from the one quarter, while from the other the only hymn she has taken is one which is destitute of all positive marks. But be this as it may, the principle remains indisputable, that there exists in reference to most of our hymns an ascertainable existing construction by which their obvious and natural meaning can be definitely determined.

Conscious of the force of such a position, and acting under the advice of an intelligent committee which was during an entire recess charged with the duty, the general council of the Church who constituted the present Hymnal could not have failed in seeing the practical as well as doctrinal bearing of their labors. And when the tone which it was thus in their power to give to the teaching of the Church is considered, it will be at once seen how efficient was the instrument which they held in their hands. They could not have been unaware, for instance, that on the subject of the nature of the Christian Church two courses lay open to them. Hymns could have been found or framed which would have led the worshipper to contemplate with all the fervor of poetic zeal the communion of which he was a member, as the sole branch of the Catholic Church within our national borders. In language dedicated specially to the purpose,—such as that which the New York Sunday School Union has known so well how to adopt in the present catechism,—or accommodated to it by its pre-received glosses, it would have been easy to have instilled into the service the doctrine that through our own ministry the means of grace solely or chiefly descended; that out of its operation there was schism, and that the work of Christian labor could not be recognized unless its agency was employed. Or a widely different view might have been taken, and the devotional feeling might have been turned to the congregations of faithful men of all ages, and of all Christian denominations, as forming the communion of saints, and the Holy Catholic Church. The glorious hymn of the Trisagion could be so developed as to bring before the believer in the full majesty of spiritual communion that noble army of the faithful in Christ who are to be found under all Christian names, whether in our own privileged organization, or in those less favored bodies whose symbols are the same as ours though their outward structure is different, or even in those more imposing communions whose symbols may be corrupt, and yet in whose midst in many a heart may be beating the pulse of God's truth. Our own ritual could be made to bear emphatic testimony to the doctrine that it is the blood of Christ alone, and not any ecclesiastical badge, that is the passport to the church triumphant; and the believer might thus be led, when constructing his circle of Christian love and reverence, to draw within it, not only the martyrs of early time, and the confessors of our own Anglican communion, but to group with them the saints of the Lord, of whatever denomination, and to exult in the consciousness that he is pressing into the same dear inheritance into which entered Brainerd, still scarred and worn with his heroic mission among our own savages; and Wesley with the crown on his

head of his own gentle and saintly labors; and Pascal faint and weary, but bearing his cross even unto the valley of the shadow of death.

It has been already observed that in the definitions given in our hymns of the invisible Church, precisely this sweep is taken. The pencil of JAMES MONTGOMERY was borrowed to draw the line which was to include those in "bright array" who stand around the throne, and deeply in accordance with the apocalyptic prophecy is the reply to the questions with which the Christian is supposed to enquire as to what constitutes membership in the Church invisible. And while it cannot be maintained that the hymn carries with it any of the distinctive denominational traits belonging to Mr. Montgomery's peculiar ecclesiastical school, it must be conceded that the very fact that it *rejects* all denominational tests, and declares the invisible Church to consist by retrospection of the spiritually elect, makes the incorporation of this its leading feature into our service the more significant.

Then, again, as to the "visible" Church. It would here have been very easy to have put in rhyme the doctrines of this catechism; and if these are the doctrines of our Church "without doubt," it would have been the undoubted duty, as it certainly was within the artistic power, of the Hymn Committee, to have made them the subject of poetic redaction. Or if the texture of the visible Church was an open question, and if in consequence all reference to it, in conformity with views lately authoritatively announced, was to be suppressed, it would have been practicable though not quite so easy, to have constructed a pulpy amalgam, which after having been stripped of all muscle, bone, or cartilege, would be capable of a double meaning, or of no meaning at all. But our Hymn Committee, and af er them our General Convention,—"Council" we are told now to call it,—adopted neither of these courses. Just in the same way that our statute makers took from the arsenal of English law the common law terms "murder," "burglary," &c., and thereby brought with them the common law definitions which had been wrought into their texture, so the framers of our hymnal went into the repository of Christian theology and took from it ready made and ready clothed its symbols.—And for a definition of the *visible* Church they chose that noble hymn which, composed by TIMOTHY DWIGHT, a non-episcopal divine, had formed for years the formula in which non-episcopalians had described the Church on earth. It is here we find the kind of Catholicity this portion of our standard adopts. And not unworthy of our Church is it so. Not unworthy of our American Episcopal Church is it that she should join in that melody which in all reformed

communions in the land of her love arises to celebrate the beauty and loveliness of our Redeemer's earthly kingdom :

"I love thy kingdom, Lord,
The house of thine abode,
The Church our blest Redeemer saved
With his own precious blood.

"I LOVE THY CHURCH, O GOD;
HER WALLS BEFORE THEE STAND,
DEAR AS THE APPLE OF THINE EYE,
AND GRAVEN ON THY HAND."

Not unworthy indeed was it of our lineage and rank as the fairest and purest of these Protestant Churches, that we should thus step forward to maintain the true Catholicity of the reformation, and not unworthy of the work of thus expressing the faith of the Catholic Church of America was the man who was thus made its organ. For to Timothy Dwight, is, under God, to be chiefly attributed the victory that in the beginning of this century was won on our own shores by the army of the militant church over the subtle and malignant bands of philosophic infidelity. Before him, in his commanding post as President and Pastor, passed in array one-third of the men, who from 1800 to 1825 entered into the learned professions from collegiate institutions; and among them, such was the energy, humanly speaking, of his vindication of the divinity of Christianity, scarcely a sceptic ever left his halls; and such was the fervor and evangelical fidelity of his pastoral labors that more than half of the immense number who were thus from year to year distilled into the community bore into it the cross of an humble and earnest discipleship, and more than one-third become ministers of the Word. And now when the collection of majestic sermons which bear his name are turned to by the student as one of the most compendious expositions of revealed truth in our tongue,—when the Christian lingers with glistening eye over that most touching appeal, which closed his ministry, from the text, "The Harvest is past," and recollects that under God's influence it was the opening of a revival which brought hundreds of educated young men to the foot of the cross, and among them so many of our own clergy,—readily will we admit the justice of our own policy in thus striking away from the perspective of the Christian system the underbrush of subordinate organizations and presenting to the eye of the beholder in the full splendor of its majestic proportions "the city of our God," "Jerusalem upon earth," the abode of that mighty host of all names, climates and tongues, who have been enrolled in the Christian armament.

Still more emphatic do we find the construction thus attached to our standards in reference to the *ministry.*

It is not maintained that so far as *our own services are concerned, or the administration of the sacraments within our own communion,* the language either of our hymnal or our ordinal, points to any other ministry than one episcopally authorized. To us it is the only one competent or able to officiate in our midst, and when we join in invocations for the ministry of the Church, or in hymns of exultation or encouragement at its progress and mission, we refer primarily to our own clergy in the same way that when we pray for those "in authority" we refer primarily to our own civil magistrates. Nor does the fact of our taking in a relative view a wider range, and in the higher sphere of Catholic observation overlooking those distinctive features which make our own system the most apostolic as well as the most evangelical, at all derogate from the subjective necessity of these very peculiarities to the constitution of a ministry *so far as concerns ourselves.* But when we come to view the Christian Church as an aggregate, these very lines of demarcation vanish. As if to attest the Catholicity of our vision, we again select the language of non-episcopalians for the exhibition of the generic type. Dr. Watts, a non-episcopalian, is resorted to for a paraphrase of the Gospel ministerial commission, and the hymn "Go, preach my Gospel, saith the Lord," is taken entire from his collection. And our only other hymn on the nature of the ministerial character is taken from Philip Doddridge, also a non-episcopalian. In this hymn,—a favorite symbol of modern Anglo-Catholicism,—we have a striking instance of the baseless nature of the Tractarian glosses. It is maintained that in the lines

> "The Saviour, when to heaven he rose,
> In splendid triumph o'er his foes
> Scattered his gifts on men below,
> And wide his royal bounties flow,—
> —So shall the bright succession run, &c."

we distinctly announce the verity of the apostolical succession of Episcopacy and declare its personal establishment by our Lord.—But in point of fact Doddridge, and after him the great congeries of Churches which adopted his words, meant not a sacramental chain, whose power, like electricity, runs through a single line and is dependant upon a material and physical continuity, but an official and aggregate current of Gospel office-bearers who to the outward eye appear set apart from the body of the Church as "pastors and teachers." The context of the hymn would itself show this, if Dod-

DRIDGE'S meaning could be supposed obscure. And with this hymn we close our notice of this branch of our standards, advancing but two propositions:

(1.) Terms such as "succession," "ministry," "church," are used by our hymns not in a denominational, but in a Catholic sense, and refer not to our own communion, but to the gross body of professing Christians.

(2.) Our General Convention of 1831 thought about the same on the subject of the "church" and the "ministry," as the framers of our church policy in 1780.

The critical portion of the present pamphlet is now closed, and the reader will find placed before him first the views announced by the "General P. E. S. S. Union and Church Book Society," for the instruction of the young of our communion on the subject of church organization, and then the views of our immediate ecclesiastical authorities on the same subject. One or two incidental points it may not be out of place to notice.

(1.) The "General P. E. S. S. Union" will at once see the impropriety of publishing text books such as the present under the mask of a *general* association, with the whole list of our Bishops as Vice-Presidents. Let the Rev. Wm. Staunton and his colleagues contemplate for a moment the present pamphlet, which it is to be feared is the extremest case that can be suggested to their sensibilities, sent broad-cast over the church with the name of Mr. Staunton himself at its top as editor, flanked by a titular board under the pretended presidency of Bishop WHITTINGHAM. Certainly the term imposition would be the lightest they would apply to so unauthorized an appropriation of their respectable names to the aid of doctrines which they notoriously repudiate. They will see at once, therefore, the impropriety of issuing under the names of our Bishops and of our church at large, tracts whose doctrines at the best are but an experiment,—are in flat contradiction to our established teachings,—and have been publicly repudiated by a large proportion of those very men whose names are sent flying over the country as their endorsers.

(2.) That portion of our communion which adheres *ex animo* to the natural sense of our standards, and the interpretation put upon them by what to us is Catholic consent, will find it impracticable to enter upon any basis of union with the Rev. Wm. Staunton and his associates for the production of a "Church literature." The truest, the wisest, and the most sensible course is for us, while conceding to them the right to publish under their own names whatever individual opinions they please, to throw ourselves still more

strongly in the work of placing in circulation on an independent basis the real teaching our church.

The enquiry, however, lies deeper than this.

Which of these two systems is best calculated to subserve the interests of true religion? Concerning the first, the past is the best reply. The church has grown up greatly under the system of a moderate episcopal theory. Those who hold it have given the best evidence of their attachment to the distinctive principles of their communion. They have devoted the noblest and the most beloved among their number to the extension of the church among heathen nations. They have been, indeed, the only ones who have thus sought to impart to our faith that catholicity which its adherence to primitive truth makes it the best qualified to assume. By their toil and devotion, four-fifths of the children collected within our Sunday schools are trained. And while those of other principles have been the most prominent in planning and filling the circuit of domestic organization, by them the pastoral work has been performed with a peculiar blessing. And when we look at the great accessions from other bodies of Christians, brought about under the ministry of those very men—when we see how with wealth, social influence, and worldly prejudice against them, they have erected the cross in THE CENTRE of THE CHURCH, and brought at least a large proportion of the communicants of that church within the influence of saving grace, and of energetic piety,—we may well render them the praise of at least church loyalty. By them—by men of moderate episcopal views, no matter what be their party title—the pastoral battle has been fought, and ungrateful indeed would it be not to render to warriors whose bravery as well as whose skill have been so proved, at least the credit of a just perception of the strength of the cause they espouse, and a true fidelity to its interests.

It is far from being intended by this to throw any doubt on the loyalty of that section of our communion by which the catechism before us is issued, and by whom it is recommended for adoption to not only every minister, but every Sunday school teacher in our church. Time, however, has not yet placed its seal upon their principles, for as is abundantly shown in the foregoing pages, these principles are an experiment at least within our denominational limits. But while they have taken the course which to them seems best to promote the interests of that Church which they esteem with a sincerity which no one has a right to impeach, they have, it has already been shown, fallen into errors of reasoning as well as of fact which cause the work they have just issued to be above

all others the most fatal to our ecclesiastical independence. They have advanced two principles, which, if true, prove our Church to be either a graceless volunteer, or a schismatic intruder.—These principles are,

1st. That without baptism episcopally performed, no man can be a Christian, when as is well stated by Bishop White, in a letter heretofore unpublished which is attached hereto, the recognition of such a doctrine would create an irremediable break in the chain of that ecclesiastical title which they themselves declare to be essential to our ecclesiastical existence.

2d. That all second episcopates are schismatic, when in point of fact our own episcopate is second to that of the Moravian which the whole English hierarchy united in preëstablishing within our own limits.

Such being the case, it may not be considered an intrusion in men who hold the older view of Episcopacy,—who "low" as they may be in their political notions, have yet so dear to their hearts the cause of that church of which they have been at least not the most unsuccessful champions,—to implore their brethren who are thus, from a misunderstanding of the facts or from erroneous logic, pressing such perilous views upon the young, to pause for a moment before they open batteries as formidable as these upon the citadel of the truest and fairest Church which Christianity has as yet known.

Nor is this all. The danger is not merely *ecclesiastical.* The presentation of an extensive mechanism to young minds through the agency of which they are to be *pulled* as it were to heaven, is a policy which however well intended, is calculated to strike a fatal blow at that system of personal probation and preparation so necessary to the due development of society, as well as to those doctrines of grace which render the dealings of God with the soul, direct, personal and immediate. The catechism of the "Church Book Society" extends, as the first pages of this tract shows, precisely such a mechanism as will lull the young at least into the belief that through it they can be transferred to a world of bliss very much in the same way as the merchant of the eastern fiction, while dealing in his shop, while buying and selling, marrying and giving in marriage,—was to be transferred on a magical carpet to another and distant land. The Gospel system does not do this.

Dark indeed are the caverns in which the sons of men are condemned to toil during their mortal pilgrimage, and gloomier still are the regions to which these caverns lead. But in the mercy of God, through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, a shaft has been

sunk by which the darkness below is dispelled and a medium of escape given. Let it be never forgotten, however, that it is by the ladder of faith,—and the metaphor is not bold since Scripture itself authorizes it,—that the ascent is to be effected. Grace is extended, but man must use his own strength to mount. When on the lowest bar he is in the hands of the Lord, but still he must continue to mount faithfully, painfully, and laboriously. No mechanism is extended to him into which he can supinely fling himself and thus be securely swung to the top. It is well for this world, and if it be permitted to use the expression, it is well for the next, that no such mechanism exists. If there did, there would be but little known of that patient striving after holiness, of that heroic and yet anxious courage, and of that importunate wrestling with the Angel of the Presence, by which the Christian pilgrim is marked. Circumspection, severe and almost agonizing self-discipline, zealous and restless energy for the making sure of one's own salvation and for that of others, would scarcely be called into existence when the "child" is told that all that is necessary is for him to hitch his car to the chain of an apostolical succession and then to be lifted into the outer air. But for him to learn, when he has done this,—when he is thus suspended midway,—that the very teaching which he has obeyed proves that the chain itself is defective,—for him to find on inspection that it cannot even bear its own weight for a moment longer,—a discovery like this in its direct influence on the soul as well as its reflex influence upon the church itself cannot but be disastrous. Well would it be if those by whom is constructed this system, which on its face is incapable of even self-support, would consider the danger to which they thus expose themselves and others. But if they do not,—if from what it may not be uncharitable to consider a perversion of the perceptive or the reasoning powers they continue blind to the perilous consequences of their own teaching, as well as to its wide departure from our acknowledged standards,—it will be well for all who accept these standards in the sense by which they have been received by almost our entire communion to unite in establishing such a literature as at least will not detach our CHILDREN from the faith of our FATHERS.

APPENDIX A.

SCRIPTURAL DEFINITIONS OF THE CHURCH.

The Holy Catholic Church was visible from the first, because the institution of sacrifice was committed to it,—the institution followed by the faithful Abel, and rejected by the deistical infidel Cain. It grew into open and notorious distinction in the line of Seth, when men "began to call upon the name of the Lord," evidently in the way of public worship and profession, and "the sons of God" are therefore described in contradistinction from "the daughters of men." It passed through several stages of development, first the patriarchal, including the covenant with Noah, the call of Abraham, and the new rite of Circumcision; secondly, the Levitical or Mosaic; thirdly, the apostolical, after Christ had actually come and fulfilled the types and prophecies of His atoning sacrifice. From that time, it was built on the special truth confessed by Peter, when he declared by divine inspiration, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." And such was the judgment of all the most eminent of the primitive fathers; for they held that the Church of Christ was to be built henceforth not on the *person*, but on the faith of Peter, and against that Church, so founded on the true faith, "the gates of hell should not prevail." But in all these progressive developments, the principle was the same, *faith* in the Saviour, according to the measure of the revelation, or Word of God; and the fruits of faith in *practical holiness*. And hence the true Church is equally infallible in both, first, because the Word of the Almighty Lawgiver has always connected them together; secondly, because "the gates of hell" must "prevail" against all who "hold the truth in unrighteousness, as certainly as against those who attempt to hold righteousness independent of truth; and thirdly, because the only real and saving faith is that which "worketh by love, and purifieth the heart, and overcometh the world."

The proof of this is so abundant in Scripture, that no Romish sophistry can stand against it for a moment. Thus St. Paul, (Rom. ix.) speaking of the Jews, saith that to them "pertain the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises, whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever, Amen." But the same great apostle limits the promises to the *elect*, or the truly faithful. "For they are *not all Israel*, which are *of Israel*, neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children, but in Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, they which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God; but *the children of the promise are counted for the Seed.*" (ib. 6, 8.) And again saith he in the same epistle, (ch. ii. 28,) "For he is not a

Jew which is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh. But *he is a Jew which is one inwardly*, and the circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit and not in the letter, *whose praise is not of men but of God.*"

The same doctrine is applied by the Apostle to the Christian Church. "They that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh but in the spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the spirit of Christ, *he is none of his*. And if Christ be in you, the body is dead, because of sin; but the spirit is life because of righteousness. For as many as are *led by the Spirit of God*, THEY are the Sons of God." For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate, to be *conformed to the image of his Son*, that he might be the first born among many brethren. Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified, and whom he justified, them he also glorified." (Rom. viii. 8, 9, 10, 14, 29, 30.)

In this connexion we find the Church spoken of currently. "Paul —to the *Church of God* which is at Corinth, to them that are *sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints.*" (1 Cor. i. 2.)

"Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you. If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy, for *the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are.*" (ib. iii. 16.)

"For ye are bought with a price, therefore glorify God *in your body, and in your spirit*, which are God's." (ib. vi. 29.)

"Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils. Ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and the table of devils." (ib. x. 21.)

"For *by one Spirit* are we all *baptized into one body*—and have been all made to drink into that one Spirit." (ib. xii. 13.)

"Now ye are *the body of Christ*, and members in particular." (ib. v. 27.) In precise accordance with the same principle of holiness, St. Peter declared unto Simon the magician, after he had been regularly baptized by Philip, "Thou hast *neither part nor lot in this matter, nor thy heart is not right* in the sight of God." (Acts. viii. 21.)

Hence "the Church is the *body of Christ*, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all," saith St. Paul. (Eph. i. 23.) "For we are his workmanship, *created in Christ Jesus unto good works*, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them. In whom ye also are *builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit.* (ib. ii. 10, 22.) "For this ye know, that no *whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man*, who is an idolator, *hath any inheritance* in the kingdom of Christ and of God. Be not ye therefore partakers with them."

"The fruit of the Spirit is in all *goodness and righteousness and truth.*" "Have *no fellowship* with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them." Christ "loved the Church and gave himself for it, that he might *sanctify* and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, *not having spot nor wrinkle, nor any such thing* but that it should be *holy and without blemish.*" (Eph. v. 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 25-7.) "The Church of the living God, is the pillar and ground of the truth." (1 Tim. iii. 15.) "He that sanctifieth and *they who are sanctified* are all of one, for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren, *in the midst of the Church will I sing praise unto thee.*" (Heb. ii. 11, 12.)

We might multiply such texts to the size of a volume, but these are abundantly sufficient to prove that the Church to which our Lord promised infallibility is composed of His spiritual and faithful people. It was infallible in the rule of *doctrine*, because it adhered to the Word of God, delivered orally in the first ages, before there could be a written record, but committed to the safer form of writing, according to the divine command, by Moses and the prophets, and closed by the inspired apostles and evangelists in the Scriptures of the New Testament. It was equally infallible in the *rule of life*, because, "without holiness, no man shall see the Lord." Neither of these could have it without the other. It was impossible to "serve two masters." And therefore the notion of Rome that Christ is present with their popes and bishops in Council, to give infallibility in doctrine, though not present to give infallibility in moral rightcousness and holiness, is a pure absurdity.

We find accordingly that the primitive Christian fathers gave no countenance to such a fallacious dogma. Thus Origen and many others interpret "the gates of hell," which our Lord declares shall "not prevail against this Church," to be, *not only errors in doctrine*, but rather *sins of heart and life*—such as pride, envy, gluttony, licentiousness, and all the other works of the fleshly or carnal mind, which every Christian renounces in his baptism. And it is evident that this agrees with the Saviour's own teaching. For in his description of the judgment, where the wicked are represented as saying unto Him, "Lord, Lord, we have eaten and drunk in thy presence, and thou hast taught in our streets," the stern sentence is set forth, "I NEVER KNEW YOU, Depart from me, *ye workers of iniquity.*" The true principle is also clearly announced in the parable of the wheat and the tares, which grew *in the same field;* for He explains the wheat to be the *children of the kingdom,* and the tares to be the *children of the wicked one.* And in like manner He tells the Jews, though belonging outwardly

to the church which had been planted by his own authority under Moses and Aaron, "*Ye are of your father, the devil,* and the lusts of your father ye will do."

Brought to this test, the claims of the modern Church of Rome, under the papal Antichrist, are seen to be utterly unscriptural and preposterous. She dares not deny, in the face of her own Councils and historians, that the vast mass of her popes, bishops, priests, and monks, were sunk into the depths of licentiousness, to the scandal of all Europe, for centuries before the Reformation. She dares not deny that the great majority of the prelates who ruled her, and gave their sanction to such monstrous innovations upon the ancient faith, were men of the most worldly and often the most vile and flagitious character. And therefore, as it is manifestly certain that those men had utterly lost the promised infallibility in holiness of life, there was no ground for believing that they could retain infallibility in the rule of doctrine.

Yet *the Church of Christ* continued notwithstanding; and the promise was made good which our Lord delivered to his Apostles, "Lo, I am with you always; to the end of the world." As it was in the case of Israel, when the prophet Isaiah recorded the declaration, "Except the Lord had left us a seed we had been as Sodom, and been made like unto Gomorrah," so was it during the long night of papal despotism and corruption. The Apostle sets forth the principle in plain terms, "Wot ye not," saith he, "What the Scripture saith of Elias? how he maketh intercession to God against Israel, saying, Lord they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars, and I am left alone, and they seek my life. But what saith the answer of God unto him? I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed down to the image of Baal. Even so then, at this present time also, *there is a remnant according to the election of grace.*" "What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but *the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded.*" (Rom. ix. 29, xi. 2—7.)

Here, therefore, we see, that in the darkest periods of human corruption, there is "a remnant according to the election of grace," who accomplish the promises and fulfil the great objects of the divine decree. Thus the patriarchal church survived and passed through the deluge into the ark of Noah. Thus, when idolatry prevailed again, Abraham was called to preserve the truth and be the father of the faithful. Thus Moses and Aaron were raised up, when the knowledge of the true God was in danger of being quite forgotten by Israel in Egypt. Thus Elijah and Elisha denounced the worshippers of Baal and Ashtaroth, though the vast majority of Israel was against them.

Thus there were some holy men remaining in Judea, "the remnant of grace," even when the great mass were condemned as a "generation of vipers." We may surely know, then, that the promises did not fail, notwithstanding the long reign of Antichrist, "sitting in the temple of God," brought in such gross corruptions of doctrine and of morals on Christianized Europe. There was a line of the elect kept up throughout the whole—good and holy bishops, priests, and doctors, who honestly rebuked the errors of their times, and called for reformation—large communities, like the Waldenses, who maintained unimpaired the pure primitive faith, and never separated till they were condemned as heretics, and compelled, by fire and sword, to stand together—Wickliff and his followers in England—Huss and Jerome of Prague, in Bohemia, with a long list of others, whose names are stigmatized by Romish calumny, and their doctrines misrepresented, but who seem to have been agreed in the main principles of the gospel as they were taught in the Word of God, and held in the primitive Church of the first pure centuries. True, they were persecuted, opposed and borne down by the rulers under the papacy, but yet they were the sound portion of the Church—the genuine members of Christ's mystical body, who, like the primitive fathers, held up the Bible as the only supreme rule of doctrine and of life, and with whom "the remnant according to the election of grace," appeared visibly and openly, contending against the world, the flesh, and the devil, and denouncing the papal Antichrist, until the Reformation came, which cast the despotic usurper out of our mother Church, and proclaimed the only true infallibility which the Word of God established for his people, in living faith and practical holiness.

APPENDIX B.

BISHOP WHITE ON NON-EPISCOPAL BAPTISM AND THE SUCCESSION.

[FROM THE ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPT.]

DEAR SIR:—You have communicated to me, from the Rev. Mr. ———, the request of my opinion on a point of ministerial duty. My esteem for him and conviction of the importance of his inquiry induced this early answer.

I do not think that a clergyman of our church is justifiable in administering the Ordinance of Baptism to persons who have been received, or intended to be received within the Christian pale under non-Episcopal administrations but with forms accompanied by the element of water, and in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

In the last rubric but one, under the head of "Private Baptism," it appears that the said two circumstances are thought the only essential parts of the Ordinance.

Perhaps, the best interpretation of laws, is early practice under them; especially if it have been continued through ages, and without interruption. This is precisely the case, with the construction given to the present subject by the Church of England.

Previously to the Reformation, it was a frequent and allowed practice for midwifes to baptize in cases of emergency. To give a check to this, it was provided in the conference held at Hampton Court under James the First, that none but duly authorized ministers should administer the Ordinance. But the provision was without nullifying the act, when otherwise performed. On the contrary it was contended, without disallowance by one of the Bishops, that this was agreeable to the practice of the primitive church; and by another of them, that "to bar private persons from baptizing was to cross all antiquity." Soon after there arose the party of the Puritans, which led to their secession under the name of the Presbyterians. Doubtless their ministers and those ordained by them, performed the office of Baptism, which was irregular after the prohibition of Hampton Court; and yet their acts were held good, under the maxim "quod non debet fieri, factum valet." Light may be gathered from the circumstances in which the Church was placed by the Restoration of Charles the Second. A generation had grown up, of which a great proportion, probably the majority, had received non-Episcopalian baptism. Yet it does not appear that any question was made of its validity.

The first we read of this was in the latter part of the reign of Queen Ann; when it was a political manœuvre, intended to discredit the family on whom the crown had been entailed. The Jacobites being in high spirits from the prospect of introducing the Pretender, it was thought conducive to the end to charge the said family with being unbaptized Lutherans, and therefore not qualified to occupy the throne.

This pretence had so extensive a circulation as to draw the attention of the Bishops. The result was a general meeting of them at the palace of the Archbishop of Canterbury; when they came to a unanimous resolution to discourage dissenting baptism, but not to add to it that which is Episcopalian. A detailed account of this matter may be seen in the Arch-Deaconal charges of Dr. Thomas Sharp, son of Archbishop Sharp, of York, and father of the late Granville Sharp. It appears to me that what has been stated should silence the scruples, which Mr. ——— finds to be pressing on the consciences of some of his parishioners. But if the embarrassment should continue, it may be well to counterbalance it by the scruples likely to be excited in others, by the introduction of a novel and unnecessary practice. *Not only so, it may lead to the further measure of calling for an ecclesiastical law for its support. Consistency will require this.*

These remarks are made only on the ground of what the Church requires of her ministers. If there should be an appeal to Scripture, it will not be pretended, either that there is expressly a limitation of the power to the clergy, or that it is necessarily implied in the commission given to ordain. The negative of this, is at least probable from several passages.

The fruit of the Sermon of St. Peter delivered immediately after the descent of the Holy Ghost, was that "there were added to the Church about three thousand souls," who were immediately baptized. It seems impossible that it should have been in one day by the twelve Apostles, then the only commissioned ministry. This passage was brought forward in the Conference at Hampton Court. When Philip baptized the Ethiopian eunuch and many of the inhabitants of Samaria, he was only a deacon, and it was soon after he was set apart with six others, for the care of the poor. Now although our non-Episcopalians make too much of this, contending that deacons should be kept within the bounds of the original appointment, contrary as we think to evidence of their being afterwards employed in other services, yet it is very improbable that in the incipient stage of their ministration, there had taken place such an enlargement of their commission as warranted the remark of St. Paul, "they who discharge the office of a deacon well, purchase to themselves a good degree and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus." When St. Peter commanded

that Cornelius and his household should be baptized, it must have been through the instrumentality of the three men who accompanied him, in the mention of whom, there is nothing which suggests the idea of their being of the number of the ordained. If these sentiments be correct, subsequent restraint, although highly reasonable, was by ecclesiastical authority.

The present question has a serious effect on that of the Episcopacy, invalidating the acts of the many English Bishops, and of some of our own Church. If we extend the retrospect to the ages before the Reformation, it is doubtful whether there be a validly ordained Bishop in Christendom. The only solution of the difficulty has been the likening of the transaction to the case of a Sovereign Prince who should constitute as his ambassador a man who is not his subject. But there is a wide difference between the two cases. In that of the prince the contemplated agency has respect to two co-ordinate sovereignties. In the other case the mission is to multitudes naturally estranged from God. Of the number are the supposed heralds for the gathering and the governing of churches. To suppose them sent without the prescribed test of their own allegiance, and of an interest taken in the work, is to imagine a provision not suited to Divine wisdom. No such notion was in the mind of St. Paul when he said to Timothy, "the things thou hast heard of me, the same commit thou to faithful men;" thus designated by a word of which the original is correctly applied in the New Testament to persons in the character of members of the Christian Church. The same Apostle prescribes that a Bishop be "apt to teach." But can this belong to his character when on the condition of his admission to the Episcopacy, he is considered either as relieved from teaching of matters so important as the sacraments; or as required to teach them in such a manner as implies a dispensing with compliance.

Those of the Clergy who shall adopt the theory here rejected, may well be embarrassed by what Scripture says expressly that there is "One Baptism." How will the pastor of a congregation reconcile this with the admission of any member of it to the communion on the ground of non-Episcopal Baptism, and the treating of it as a nullity in another.

My Dear Sir, I have delivered my sentiments on the subject. In transmitting them to Mr. ———, be pleased to assure him of an interest taken by me in his concerns, both personal and ministerial. And be assured that I am affectionately,

Your well wisher,

Dec. 19, 1832. WM. WHITE.